AD-751 761

DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF A NEW ACB AND APTITUDE AREA SYSTEM

Milton H. Maier, et al

Army Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory Arlington, Virginia

September 1972

DISTRIBUTED BY:



National Technical Information Service U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield Va. 22151

DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF A NEW ACB AND APTITUDE AREA SYSTEM

Milton H. Maier and Edmund F. Fuchs

MILITARY SELECTION RESEARCH DIVISION

Reproduced by
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U S Department of Commarce
Springfield VA 22151





U. S. Army
Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory

September 1972

Approved for public release, distribution unlimited.

BEHAVIOR AND SYSTEMS RESEARCH LABORATORY

An activity of the Chief, Research and Development

J. E. UHLANER Director

ACC 1001014 for		7	
RTIS	מכילכים הילא	1	
DOC	Bul Siction		
UMAR 1 1750			
JUST 11 CATTOR			
BY	LVAILEBILITY COO	1	
Dist KA	IL. end/er creci	AL	
A			

NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION: Primary distribution of this report has been made by BESRL. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to: U. S. Army Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory, Attn: RDMR-BLZ, 1300 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22209.

FINAL DISPOSITION: This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory.

<u>NOTE:</u> The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

المساور الحال المربيع المساول عن المساور المساور المساور المساور المساور المساور المساور المساور المساور المسا 		
	T CONTROL DATA - R & D .	
(Security classification of title, body of abstract and 1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate nuthor)		
1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)	ZZ. REPORT	SECURITY CLASSIFICATION
Behavior and Systems Research Labora		ified
Arlington, Firginia	28. GROUP	
3. REPORT TITLE		
J. REPORT TITLE		
DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF A NEW .	ACR AND APTITIDE AREA SYST	FM
DATE DESCRIPTION OF IT ILL.		
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)		
<u> </u>		
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates) 5. AUTHOR(5) (First name, middle initial, last name)		
<u> </u>		
5. AUTHOR(5) (First name, middle initial, last name)		
5. AUTHOR(5) (First name, middle initial, last name)	7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES	76, NC. OF REFS
B. AUTHORIS) (First name, middle initial, last name) Milton H. Maier and Edmund F. Fuchs		76, No. OF REFS
S. AUTHORIS) (First name, middle initial, last name) Milton H. Maier and Edmund F. Fuchs 6. REPORT DATE		9
S. AUTHORIS) (First name, middle initial, last name) Milton H. Maier and Edmund F. Fuchs 6. REPORT DATE September 1972	70. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES SE 59	9
S. AUTHORIS) (First name, middle initial, last name) Milton H. Maier and Edmund F. Fuchs 6. REPORT DATE September 1972	70. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES SE 59	9
8. AUTHORIS) (First name, middle initial, last name) Milton H. Maier and Edmund F. Fuchs 8. REPORT DATE September 1972 88. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.	70. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES SE 59	9 IMBER(7)
S. AUTHORIS) (First name, middle initial, last name) Milton H. Maier and Edmund F. Fuchs 6. REPORT DATE September 1972 86. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. 6. PROJECT NO. DA R&D Proj. No. 20062106A722 c.	Technical Research	9 IMBER(7)
S. AUTHORIS) (First name, middle initial, last name) Milton H. Maier and Edmund F. Fuchs 6. REPORT DATE September 1972 86. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. 6. PROJECT NO. DA R&D Proj. No. 20062106A722	72. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES SET 59 PR. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NO Technical Research	9 IMBERIO Note 239
S. AUTHORIS) (First name, middle initial, last name) Milton H. Maier and Edmund F. Fuchs 6. REPORT DATE September 1972 86. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO. 6. PROJECT NO. DA R&D Proj. No. 20062106A722 c.	Technical Research	9 IMBERIO Note 239

Deputy Chief of Staif for Personnel, Wash., DC

US Continental Army Cmd., Ft Monroe, VA

Army personnel managers have a continuing need to select, classify, and assign to

12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

Army personnel managers have a continuing need to select, classity, and assign to training and jobs large numbers of men who enter the service. Since the Army Classification Battery (ACB) is an integral part of the assignment process, accuracy of scores has a significant influence on the appropriateness of assignment. BESRL's DIFFERENTIAL CLASSIFICATION Work Unit has an ongoing research program to keep the classification battery effective and up to date. As part of the overall effort, a new ACB and aptitude area system have been developed which result in an improved system of classification for training and jobs. The description of the new psychological test battery and aptitude areas and an assessment of their effectiveness in relation to the utilization and performance of Army enlisted input is given in Technical Research Report 1177. The present publication deals with BESRL research conducted to evaluate a large number of tests as predictors of success in the different groups of Military Occupational Specialties (MOS) and to select tests for aptitude area composites.

Experimental tests and tests of the operational ACB (administered to about 25,000 men in over 100 MOS training courses) were evaluated against performance in the training courses. Validity coefficients of the variables with final course grades in the MOS courses were computed and corrected to reflect population values. Regression equations for all tests were computed in each MOS sample, and for each MOS group a sequence of test selections was performed to determine which tests contributed significantly to validity. These statistical analyses resulted in a test battery of 16 measures and the formulation of 9 aptitude areas designated as selectors for 9 MOS

DD FORM 1473 REPLACES DD FORM 1475. I JAN 64, WHICH IS
OBSOLETZ FOR ARMY USE.

Inclassified
Security Classification

DD Form 1473

13. ABSTRACT - Continued

groups. Each aptitude area consisted of from three to five tests, each unit-weighted. Finally, through simulation runs, estimates were derived of operational effects of introducing the new classification system.

Findings indicate the new Army Classification Battery and aptitude areas to be superior to the previous system. Average validity of the new aptitude area composites across all MOS groups is higher than that of the previous composites. Supporting statistical analyses are provided in detailed tables in appendixes to the Research Note.

Unclassified

Security Classification		-				
KEY WORDS	LIN		ROLE	K B	ROLE	K C
	ROLE	WT	AOLE		NOCE	w.,
Differential classification						
* Army Classification Battery						
* Aptitude areas						
* Classification sys:em						
Aptitude area composite						
* Aptitude area system					,	
* Military Occupational Specialty (MOS)						
Military psychology						
Psychological Measurement						
Statistical analyses						
Test validity						
Validity patterns						
					j	
						j
						İ
٠ ،						
1' 1"						

		Ĺ	<u> </u>	
	assifi			
 Security	Classifi	cation		

AD

DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF A NEW ACB AND APTITUDE AREA SYSTEM

Milton H. Maier and Edmund F. Fuchs

MILITARY SELECTION RESEARCH DIVISION Edmund F. Fuchs, Chief

BEHAVIOR AND SYSTEMS RESEARCH LABORATORY

Office, Chief of Research and Development
Department of the Army

1300 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22209

September 1972

Army Project Number 20062106A722

1 V

Differential Classification b-11

BESRL Technical Research Reports and Technical Research Notes are intended for sponsors of R&D tasks and other research and military agencies. Any findings ready for implementation at the time of publication are presented in the latter part of the Brief. Upon completion of a major phase of the task, formal recommendations for official action normally are conveyed to appropriate military agencies by briefing or Disposition Form.

FOREWORD

The DIFFERENTIAL CLASSIFICATION Work Unit applies psychological measurement methods to enable the Army to make best use of the skills and aptitudes of its enlisted personnel through increasingly accurate and differentiated measures of individual potential. Research is conducted to maintain and improve the effectiveness of the Army Classification Battery and related techniques and of conditions which may interact with the classification tests and thus affect the basis for utilization of the enlisted input-changes () training programs and job content and environment, for example.

As part of the overall effort, a new Army Classification Battery and new aptitude areas have been developed which result in an improved system of classification for training and jobs. The present Technical Research Note deals with BESRL research conducted to evaluate a large number of tests as predictors of success in the different groups of Military Occupational Specialties and to select tests for aptitude area composites.

The entire research work unit is responsive to special requirements of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel and the U. S. Continental Army Command, as well as to objectives of Army RDT&E Project 2Q062106A722, "Selection and Behavioral Evaluation, "FY 1972 Work Program.

J. E. UHLANER, Director Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory

DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF A NEW ACB AND APTITUDE AREA SYSTEM

BRIEF

Requirement:

To develop and evaluate a new Army Classification Battery (ACB) and new aptitude area composites for use in the selection of enlisted men and their classification to training and jobs.

Procedure:

Experimental and operational tests made up a battery administered to about 25,000 men in over 100 Army Military Occupational Specialty (MOS) training courses. Validity coefficients of experimental and operational test variables with final course grades in the MOS courses were computed. Coefficients were corrected to reflect population values. Regression equations for all tests were computed in each MOS sample, and MOS judged similar in job demands and showing similar test validity patterns were combined. For each MOS group, a sequence of test selections was performed to determine which tests contributed significantly to validity. These statistical analyzes resulted in a test battery of 16 measures and the formulation of nine aptitude areas designated as selectors for nine MOS groups. Each aptitude area consists of from three to five tests, each test being unit weighted. Finally, through simulation runs, eximates were made of operational effects of introducing the new classification system.

Findings:

THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O

Mean validity coefficient for the new ACB is .65, compared to .55 for the prior battery. A 20 percent reduction in attrition in advanced individual training estimated as a result of the higher validity.

In the simulation runs, overall level of predicted training performance was considerably higher with the new system. Taking 100 as base score representing expected performance under random assignment, mean predicted criterion score with the new battery was 104.6 compared to 102.6 with the old battery.

A more equitable distribution of ability across MOS groups is attained with the new battery. In all job areas, predicted performance is above average, means running from 103 to 108.

With the new system, the number of men performing at superior levels is increased by 15 percent; the number of men performing at marginal levels is decreased by 20 percent.

Because general mental ability is more strongly reflected in every aptitude area composite than in the previous composites, fewer men of marginal mental level (10-30 AFQT score) will achieve one or more aptitude area scores of 90 or above. So long as aptitude area scores enter into the screening process, more men in AFQT Category IV (10-30) will need to be examined before a specified number of men in Category IV are qualified for service. The men who do qualify under the new system can be expected to do better in training and adapt better to Army life.

Utilization of Findings:

The new Army Classification Battery and aptitude area system is croposed for implementation in Calendar Year 1972.

DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF A NEW ACB AND APTITUDE AREA SYSTEM

CONTENTS

	Pag
BACKGROUND	1
DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEW APTITUDE AREA SYSTEM	2
The Experimental Tests Sampling and Data Collection Data Analysis Grouping the MOS Test Selection Validity of Composites Validity of Education, Age, and Selected High School Courses	2 2 5 6 7 9
EVALUATION OF THE NEW APTITUDE AREA SYSTEM	17
Reduction of Attrition Simulated Evaluation of Performance Selection of Men with Marginal Mental Ability	17 17 23
CONCLUSION	28
LITERATURE CITED	29
APPENDIXES	31
DISTRIBUTION	50
DD Form 1473 (Document Control - R&D)	52
TABLES	
Table 1. Description of experimental tests	3
2. Composition of MOS groups	10

Tables (Cont)

		Pag
3.	Content of new and prior Army classification batteries	12
4.	New aptitude area composites	13
5.	Validity of new ACB composites	15
6.	Mean beta weights of level of education, age, and arithmetic reasoning	16
7.	Mean predicted criterion scores under the new aptitude area system and under the previous system	19
8.	Expected performance in old and new aptitude area systems	21
9.	Mean predicted criterion scores with assignments made by different weighting schemes	23
10.	Distribution of number of AQB aptitude area scores at or above 90 for men in mental category IV	26
11.	Distribution of number of new aptitude area scores at or above 90 for full range of mental ability	27

DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF A NEW ACB AND A?TITUDE AREA SYSTEM

A new Army Classification Battery and a new aptitude area system have been developed to meet more effectively the needs of the modern Army. Since the 1958 aptitude area system was introduced operationally, technological changes have greatly increased the complexity of Army jobs. Greater competence—in some cases a different kind of competence—is required of the men who make up the Army's enlisted forces. Training programs have been redesigned to develop the competence and skills required. Some Army schools training enlisted men for assignment in Military Occupational Specialties (MOS) have asked for more comprehensive measures of trainability so that the men selected on the basis of a given aptitude area prerequisite will have greater likelihood of successfully completing the training.

To meet changing requirements, the Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory has conducted a large-scale research program to develop more appropriate classification measures. Experimental and operational tests were administered to about 25,000 men in over 100 different training courses, covering the gamut of openings available to newly enlisted men. The men came from all over the country and were representative of Army input. The sampling of men and training courses provided a solid scientific base for developing a new Army Classification Battery and aptitude system.

Experimental tests and tests of the operational Army Classification Battery (ACB) were evaluated against performance in the training courses. The first test of a recruit's ability to meet Army demands occurs in his job training course, and job training grades are the first objective assessment of how well individuals perform in their initial assignments. These initial assignments are made largely on the basis of ACB measures. For these purposes the accuracy with which training grades are predicted serves as a standard by which to evaluate the effectiveness of the classification tests.

Operational test scores and background data were obtained from official records. The experimental tests were administered to trainees in the courses as the men began their instruction. The men in each course were followed through training to obtain measures of how well they succeeded in subsequent duty assignments. Analysis of these date will be presented in a separate report.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEW APTITUDE AREA SYSTEM

The Experimental Tests

The experimental measures were designed to expand the test coverage of the operational ACB and to update certain of the component cests. Included were measures of interest in a number of occupational areas. New tests were tried out to extend measurement in the important domain of general mental ability. Updated versions and modifications of existing tests were included in the domains of mechanical ability and perceptual ability. The experimental tests are described in Table 1.

Each test in the experimental battery was designed to measure a set of skills, knowledge, or interests related to performance in a group of MOS. Previous developmental research had shown that the experimental test were valid for some MOS, but their differential: validity for various occupational areas and the extent of their unique validity remained to be determined. The present analysis was designed to getermine whether each of the tests was an accurate predictor of success in a relevant group of MOS -- for example, a test of mechanical ability must be valid for mechanical maintenance MOS -- and whether it makes a unique contribution to prediction -- that is, has a large beta weight. It should also have its highest validity for related MOS, and lower validity for unrelated MOS. Mechanical tests, for example, should be less valid for clericaladministrative jobs than for mechanical jobs. Tests of general ability may have validity for a wide variety of jobs because successful performance in most jobs requires a significant component of general mental ability. The requirement for differential validity therefore is not so stringent for these tests.

Sampling and Data Collection

The samples on which experimental and operational test scores and background data were collected have been described in BESRL Technical Research Report 1159½. The MOS training courses contained some students who had had extensive Army training and job experience. The training performance of these men is probably of a different order than that of men who recently entered the Army. The samples were purified by deleting all men who were known to have had other Army job assignments. Female trainees were also dropped from the samples. The population to which the results of this research generalize is composed of males who recently entered the Army and are in their initial training program.

Maier, M.H. and E.F. Fichs. Development of improved aptitude area composites for enlisted classification. Technical Research Report 1150, (AD 831 268) Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory, Arlington, VA. September 1060.

Table 1

DESCRIPTION OF EXPERIMENTAL TESTS

- 1. <u>Subtraction and Division</u> (100 items). The task involves simple arithmetic computations; no reading is required.
- 2. Tool Knowledge (20 items). The task is to identify the functions of hand tools, or to identify which tool among the alternatives is used in the same trade as the tool shown in the item. The item and alternatives are always shown in pictorial form, with the exception of the last item, which contains words in the alternatives.
- 3. <u>Differential Classification Inventory</u>. The task in one group of items is to indicate the activity the person thinks he is best at or would rather do. In other items, the respondent is to rate the quality of his performance or level of interest, or to describe his perception of himself and of others. Four scores are obtained:

Electronics Interest Scale (20 items)
Mechanical Interest Scale (20 items)
Clerical Interest Scale (20 items)
General Adjustment Scale (20 items)

- 4. <u>Electronics Information</u> (20 items). The task is to identify electrical and electronic equipment and components and to define electrical terms.
- 5. Mechanical Comprehension (20 items). Measures knowledge of mechanical forces, valves, gears, and pulleys.
- E. <u>Mathematics Knowledge</u> (20 items). Measures ability in algebra, geometry, and interpretation of graphs.
- 7. <u>Science</u> (20 items). Measures ability to read electrical diagrams, identify electrical components, and explain electrical circuits.
- 8. <u>Personal Inventory for Electronics</u>. Includes items on attitudes toward authority figures, home and school background, frequency of using tools, activities engaged in, and personality items. Four items are in common, Two scores are derived:

High Skill (25 items) Low Skill (25 items)

7. Pattern Analysis % 20 items). The task is to identify which of four forms results from folding a pattern.

Table 1 continued

- 10. Science Knowledge (50 items). Measures knowledge of biclogy, chemistry, physiology, and medicine.
- 11. <u>Electronics Pictures</u> (20 items). The task is to identify electrical components and various symbols used in electrical diagrams.
- 12. Occupational Interest Inventory. Examinee indicates degree of liking for specific activities of the job and desired level of supervision and skill requirements in a job. Scores are obtained on three areas of interest:

Biological (20 items)
Construction (20 items)
General Job (20 items)

The examinee also indicates whether he has had each of the following ten high school courses:

Biology Physics
Chemistry Earth Sciences
General Science Algebra
Electrical Shop Woodwork
Hygiene Metal Work

- 13. <u>Trade Information</u> (25 items). Measures knowledge of electrical wiring, carpentry, construction equipment, hardware (as found in hardware store), and principles of design.
- 14. Attention-to-Detail (60 items). The task is to count the number of C's, which varies from zero through four, in a series of O's and C's.

Only the Subtraction and Division Test and the Attention-to-Detail Test are highly speeded. All the tests are scored $\frac{\text{rights}}{\text{only}}$ (R) except the Subtraction and Division Test, which is scored $\frac{\text{rights}}{\text{minus}}$ one-fourth wrongs (R - W/4). All the tests except two involve extensive verbal comprehension. The Subtraction and Division Test contains no words. The Tool Knowledge Test consists of pictures in the items and alternatives with a few verbal statements to identify the task for a group of items.

A large proportion of the trainees, about 25%, did not graduate on schedule, and course grades for this group, if available, were of questionable meaning. The exceptional cases consisted of three main subgroups: academic failures, academic turnbacks or recycles, and withdrawals for nonacademic reasons. The withdrawals were assumed to be randomly distributed and were dropped from further consideration. The failures and turnbacks were not randomly distributed; had they been dropped, the samples would have been biased, as men with low training performance would have been deleted. An analysis was conducted to determine how to assign grades to turnbacks and failures24 The results indicated that the scale position of failing grades was one standard deviation below minimum passing, and all failures were assigned this grade. The scale position of grades for turnbacks was one-half a standard deviation below the mean of the graduates; turnbacks without grades were assigned that grade, and if a grade was reported for a turnback, that grade was the one used in the analysis. With the inclusion of the academic failures and turnbacks, the sample for each training course had no known source of criterion bias.

Data Analysis

Validity coefficients for all tests were computed against final course grade in each MOS training course. Product-moment intercorrelation matrices of test scores and final course grade were computed for all MOS samples. Because each sample had previously been selected on the basis of operational ACB scores, the coefficients were corrected by the multivariate restriction in range formula to reflect the results that would have been obtained for a random sample of the population of men eligible for Army service. The complete matrix of intercorrelations, corrected to population values, of all test, background, and training performance variables is shown in Table A-1 of the Appendix.

At this stage, with 100 samples and more than 30 variables, over 3,000 validity coefficients had been computed. Regression equations were computed in each sample to determine what aptitudes, knowledge, and interests were important in identifying potential for success in each MOS. The results were examined to determine MOS that had similar requirements. MOS judged similar in terms of job demands and profiles of test validity were grouped in order to obtain more reliable estimates of validity. Mean validity vectors were computed for each group of MOS with the MOS samples unit-weighted rather than weighted by number of cases in each sample. Test selections were performed on the mean validity vectors to determine which tests had unique validity for each group of MOS. Finally, simulation runs were made to obtain estimates of the impact on training performance to be expected from the new classification system and to obtain estimates of the distributions of aptitude area scores at different AFQT levels.

Maier, M.H. Procedures for assigning grades to failures and turnbacks in Army school courses, Technical Research Note 107. (AD 833 582).

Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory, Arlington, VA. April 106°.

Grouping the MOS

A major problem was to find a reasonable basis for grouping the MOS into homogeneous clusters. About 90 different MOS were included in the over 100 samples obtained at the training schools. Several hundred MOS are potentially available to a recruit entering the Army. Because of quota restrictions, not all MOS are open at any one time. Even so, the number of possibilities is too great for the human mind to consider simultaneously. Besides, most of the MOS fall into homogeneous clusters involving similar jeb tasks. Rational procedures were required to find ways of reducing the complexity. Two considerations for combining MOS into meaningful groups were empirical data and operational convenience. Any grouping should combine only those MOS that are similar in the aptitudes and interests required for successful completion of training. Operational convenience required that the official Army MOS structure be followed so far as possible consistent with the research findings.

Since the mid 1950's, Army MOS have been grouped into ten occupational areas based on similar job functions--mechanical maintenance, for example. The aptitude area system was generally tied into the occupational area structure. The MOS samples in the present research were also grouped by occupational area, and the mean validity vectors were computed for each area. The standard deviation of the validity coefficients for each test in each MOS group was also computed. The results are shown in Table B-1 of the Appendix. An alternative grouping of MOS was by Career Management Fields (CMF), which were being considered for operational implementation in the early 1970's. The CMF are smaller groupings of MOS, each CMF being a set of closely related jobs. Many of the 39 CMF are expected to require similar aptitudes, knowledge, and interests. Mean validity vectors and standard deviations of validity coefficients for each CMF for which data were available were computed (Table B-2).

Each CMF was found to be relatively homogeneous, with two notable exceptions--the Field Artillery-Missiles CMF and the Air Defense CMF, both of which included electronics repair and crewman MOS. In these fields, different tests were found to be valid for the repairmen and the crewmen. For classification purposed, therefore, the repair and crewman MOS in these fields were analyzed separately.

In computing the validity vectors, each MOS sample was unit-weighted. In the case of some MOS for which large numbers of men are trained, such as Infantry, there were samples from several different training installations. Since the sample from each installation was unit-weighted, MOS with more trainees were in effect multiple weighted. The validity coefficients were not converted to z coefficients prior to averaging. Some mean vectors were based on only a few samples (only two in the Field Cannon and Rocket Artillery composite). Others were based on many samples (20 in the Electronics Repair composite). Each vector was considered to be the best estimate of the validity of the tests for a given group of MOS.

Comparison of the means and standard deviations for occupational areas and career fields indicated that the CMF were generally more homogeneous. Since the expection was that the CMF--or similar groupings--would be used operationally for grouping MOS, the decision was made to base the aptitude area classification system on the CMF structure. Similar CMF were combined, and the combinations are hereafter referred to as MOS groups.

The next step was to simplify the system by reducing the number of MOS groupings and the number of tests. Test selections were performed on the mean validity vector for each CMF, using the forward test selection technique developed by Summerfield and Lubin³. CMF for which similar tests were selected by this technique were combined. Tests not selected for any CMF are dropped. The cycle of combining CMF and dropping tests was repeated several times.

Before starting with the test selections, three tests that were operational in the old ACB were deleted from the analysis. The Pattern Analysis Test was dropped because the items were interdependent, several referring to the same diagram. The Electronics Information Test was deleted because many items were outdated. The Shop Mechanics Test was deleted because the ACB version and the Army Qualification Battery (AQB) were not parallel. (The AQB is used at Armed Forces Entrance and Examining Stations to determine eligibility for service for men in mental Category IV and for enlisted commitment.) For each of these tests, an experimental test that was equally valid—or more valid—was available and was substituted for the deleted test in the test selection and evaluation procedure for the new ACE.

The first test selection included 28 tests and 25 CMF. The results are shown in Table B-3. This selection could not be completed on four CMF because the multiple correlation coefficients were greater than unity44

Summerfield, A. and A. Lubin. A square root method of selecting a minimum set of variables in multiple regression. <u>Psychometrika</u>, 1951, <u>16</u>, 271-284.

The multiple correlation coefficients greater than unity reflects some of the problems in conducting research in an operational setting. Multiple correlation coefficients greater than one are an impossibility if the data are complete for all cases in the sample. In the Army operational setting, however, obtaining complete data on all cases is extremely difficult. Usually, in fact, a large percentage of cases have missing scores on one or more variables. Ideally, cases with missing data would be dropped from the sample when computing the multiple correlation coefficients. However, the sample size is often barely adequate when all cases are included, and to drop cases with missing data would frequently result in inadequate samples. The researcher is faced with the dilemma of including all cases, even those with missing data, a step which means that each statistic is based on the maximum number of cases, or of dropping cases with missing data, a step which satisfies the canons of statistical rigor. If all cases are included, the statistics may in some cases be inconsistent with one another because they are based on different individuals and the reduction in numbers is not on a random basis. Dropping cases with missing data has the drawback that any statistics based on a substantially reduced number of cases have larger standard errors, especially the beta weights computed in multiple regression.

These CMF were grouped with other CMF in the next test selection on the basis of similarity of validity vectors. Weights for five tests are reported because it was found that this number produced a multiple correlation coefficient about equal to that for the full set of tests. Nine tests were dropped after the first set of test selections because they were relatively unimportant or because they appeared in equations for CMF where they were not reasonable.

An expectation based on the experimental tests was that Electronics Repair MOS Ould be separated from the Electrical-Mechanical Maintenance MOS. The Electronics Picture Test and Personal Inventory for Electronics (high and low level keys) were designed to make this differentiation. Another expectation was that the Medical MOS could be differentiated from the other General Technical MOS such as Intelligence and Topography. The Bio-Chemical Information Test was designed especially to select men for Medical MOS. Results did not support use of these tests to make the desired discriminations. The Electronics Picture Test and Personal Inventory for Electronics were therefore dropped after the first round of test selections because they had little valid variance. The Bio-Chem Test was valid for Medical MOS, but also for Construction, Chemical, Administrative, and Information/Audio-Visual MOS. The Electronics and Electrical Repair and Medical MOS were kept separate in the hope that with fewer variables, a clearer picture of the uniquely valid tests for these MOS would emerge. The Crewman and Electronics Repairman MOS in Field Artillery-Missiles and Air Defense CMF were separated to determine if separate equations were appropriate for these two job groups. The net outcome left 19 tests and 19 MOS groupings for the second round of test selection.

and the second of the second s

The first five tests selected in the second round of test selections for each cluster of MOS and their beta weights are shown in Table B-4. The results were used to pool clusters that had similar composites of valid tests. Infantry-Armor and Combat Engineer MOS were similar. Electronics and Electrical/Mechanical MOS also had similar composites. Missiles and Air Defense operators, however, were distinctly different from Electronics Repairmen. Clerical, Administrative Finance, and Supply MOS were close enough to suggest that they too could be pooled. Mechanical and Aircraft Maintenance MOS were also similar, as were Combat Surveillance and Communications Operations. Another grouping that emerged from the data was a combination of Motor Transport, Missile Operators, and Food Service MOS.

A third and final round of test selections was conducted on these new groupings of MOS to determine whether the MOS could be further combined. The results of the test selection are shown in Table B-5. Two tests, the Subtraction and Division Test and the Science Test, were deleted from the battery because they had little unique validity. A third test, Tools, was dropped. Since it appeared for only one CMF--Field Cannon and Rocket Artillery--to which only a small number of men are assigned, it was not judged sufficiently useful to include in the battery. The Field Cannon and Rocket Artillery composite would have had higher validity with the Tools Test (r = .69) than without (r = .62), but the increase was deemed worth less

than the administrative cost of including the test operationally. The MOS groupings and test composites that emerged from this analysis were consistent with prior information about job families and test validity, and no further search for different combinations of MOS or tests was considered necessary.

Nine MOS groups could be differentiated on the basis of the tests in the new ACB (Table 2). The new MOS groups are generally similar to those in the old system. Infantry, previously a separate group, was combined with Armor and Combat Engineering to form a Combat group. The position of Missiles Crewmen in the occupational structure has always presented a problem. In the old system, they were part of a heterogeneous group called AE for Armor, Artillery, and Engineering. In the new system, Armor and Engineering were combined with Infantry, as already noted, and the Missiles Crewmen were found to require the same test composite as Motor Vehicle Drivers and Food Services. The latter three MOS were combined to form the OF group. OF has no counterpart in the prior system. All the Electronics and Electrical Repair MOS were combined in the EL group, even though special efforts were made to separate the more complex electronics repair MOS from the more mechanically oriented electrical repair MOS; the EL groups in the old and new systems are virtually identical.

The SC (Surveillance and Communications) group has no counterpart in the cld system. SC combines radio operator MOS, which formed the old RC group, communications center operator, MOS which were in the clerical group, and combat surveillance and target acquisition MOS from the old AE area. The remaining MOS groups, Mechanical Maintenance (MM), General Maintenance (GM), Clerical (CL), and Skilled Technical (ST), are similar in the two systems. Drivers were removed from the old MM, and a few other minor changes were made. The General Technical (GT) label was changed to ST in the new system with a view to reducing the surplus meaning attaching to the GT label which has tended to be associated with IQ.

Validity of Composites

Each MOS group has associated with it a test composite that is used as prerequisite for assignment to an MOS in that group. Symbols for MOS group and associated test composite are the same.

The final grouping of the MOS, the tests retained in the new ACB, and the tests selected for each composite all interact to form the new aptitude area system. Each aspect of the system exists only in relation to other aspects. The content of the new ACB, with changes from the old ACB, is shown in Table 3. The tests are grouped in four domains: 1) general ability, which has been expanded from three to five tests; 2) mechanical ability—one test, Shop Mechanics, has been dropped and replaced by Trade Information; 3) perceptual ability—one test, Army Clerical Speed, has been replaced by Attention—to-Detail; and 4) the Self-Description Inventory, to which three new interest scales, Attentiveness, Electronics, and

Table 2

COMPOSITION OF MOS GROUPS

MOS Group	Major Jobs in Each MOS Group
CO (Combat)	Infantry, Armor, Combat Engineer
FA (Field Artillery)	Field Cannon and Rocket Artillery
EL (Electronics Repair)	Missiles Repair, Air Defense Repair, Tactical Electronic Repair, Fixed Plant Communications Repair
OF (Operators and Food)	Missiles Crewman, Air Defense Crewman, Driver, Food Services
SC (Surveillance and Communications)	Target Acquisition and Combat Surveillance, Communication Operations
MM (Mechanical Maintenance)	Mechanical and Air Maintenance, Rails
GM (General Maintenance)	Construction and Utilities, Chemical, Marine, Petroleum
CL (Clerical)	Administrative, Finance, Supply
ST (Skilled Technical)	Medical, Military Policeman, Intelligence, Data Processing, Air Control, Topography and Printing, Information and Audio Visual

Maintenance, have been added. Each of these occres was found to be a valid predictor of training success in one or more MOS groups. The validity coefficients of the new ACB tests for each MOS group are shown in Table B-6 (Part 1) and the beta weights are shown in Table B-7 (Part 1). The validity coefficients and beta weights for the tests not included in the new ACB are also shown (Part 2 of Tables B-6 and B-7, respectively).

The nine new aptitude area composites are shown in Table 4. All the composites contain at least one test of general mental ability; Arithmetic Reasoning occurs in seven composites, and other tests of general ability occur in the remaining two composites. Thus, the new composites have a heavier weighting of general mental ability than the old composites. The new composites are also more complex than the old ones. All the old composites contain two tests, while the new ones contain at least three, and five of the nine composites contain five tests. The operational significance of the changes in the composites is discussed in the BESRL Technical Research Report, TRR 1177, An Improved Differential Army Classification System.

An additional composite, GT (also shown in Table 4), is composed of Arithmetic Reasoning and Word Knowledge. In the old system the GT score served a dual function of selecting persons for the GT MOS group and determining which men were qualified to take additional tests such as the Officer Candidate Test and Flight Aptitude Selection Test. The former function is filled by the ST composite in the new system, while the latter function is retained for the GT score. Many Army regulations and testing programs are based on the GT score. Since the GT score is so widely used and accepted throughout the Army, it was retained at least temporarily in the new system.

The beta weights for all tests in the new ACB are shown in Appendix Table B-8. The tests with highest weights in the full regression equations were almost aiways selected for the composites.

The multiple correlation of the new ACB composites with training grades is shown in Table 5, along with the multiple correlation coefficients of the full composites of 33 variables, which include 11 operational ACB tests, 20 experimental tests, age, and years of education. The loss in validity for the shorter composites is substantial for some MOS groups, especially Field Artillery (FA). One variable that had a large beta weight in most cases was age, as shown in Table 6 and in Table B-7, which shows the regression equations for all 33 variables. Evidently, the more mature men are often better in training than their test scores

Maier, M. H., and E. F. Fuchs. An Improved Differential Army Classification System. Technical Research Report 1177, Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory, Arlington, VA. April 1972.

Table 3

CONTENT OF NEW AND PRIOR ARMY CLASSIFICATION BATTERIES

	The second secon	
New \CB	Prior ACB	Change
General Ability Tests Arithmetic Reasoning (AR) Word Knowledge (WK) General Information (GI) Mathematics Knowledge (MK) Science Knowledge (SK)	Arithmetic Reasoning (AR) Verbal (VE) General Information (GIT)	Shortened Shortened Updated and shortened Added
Mechanical Ability Tests		
Electronics Information (EI) Mechanical Comprehension (MC) Automotive Information (AI) Trade Information (TI)	Electronics Information (ELI) Mechanical Aptitude (MA) Automotive Information (AI) Shop Mechanics (SM)	Updated Updated Shortened Added Dropped
Perceptual Ability Tests		
Pattern Analysis (PA) Auditory Perception (AP)	Pattern Analysis (PA) Army Radio Code Aptitude (ARC)	Upda ted none
Attention-to-Detail (AD)	Army Clerical Speed (ACS)	Dropped Added
Classification Inventory		Enlarged
Combat Scale (CC) Attentiveress Scale (CA) Electronics Scale (CE) Maintenance Scale (CM)	Classification Inventory (CI)	Updated and shortened Added Added Added

Table 4

NEW APTITUDE AREA COMPOSITES

Test			Aptitude Area Composites								
General Ability Tests		со	FA	EL	OF	sc	אמי	GM	CI.	ST	GT
Arithmetic Reasoning General Information Mathematics Knowledge Word Knowledge Science Knowledge	(AR) (GI) (MK) (WK) (SK)	AR	AR GI MK	AR	υI	AR WK	мк	AR SK	AR WK	AR MK SK	AR WK
Mechanical Ability Tests											
Trade Information Electronics Information Mechanical Comprehension Automotive Information	(TI) (EI) (MC) (AI)	TI	EI	TI EI MC	AI	мс	TI EI AI	MC AI			
Perceptual Ability											
Pattern Analysis Attention-to-Detail Auditory Perception	(PA) (AD) (AP)	PA AD				PA AP			ΑD		
Self Description											
Combat Scale Attentiveness Scale Electronics Scale Maintenance Scale	(CC) (CA) (CE) (CM)	СС	CA	CE	CA		СМ		CA		

Legend: Aptitude Area Composites

CO=Combat SO FA=Field Artillery M EL=Electronics Gi

OF=Operator and Food GT=General Technical

The address which continue the telephone decimal properties and the second and an experience of the second
SC=Surveillance and Communications

MM=Mechanical Maintenance GM=General Maintenance

CL=Clerical

ST=Skilled Technical

GT used only to determine who is qualified to take additional tests such as the Officer Candidate Test.

indicate. Age was not included in the new composites because its use in selection and classification has broad implications, and a thorough policy review would be required if it were to be used operationally.

Validity of Education, Age, and Selected High School Courses

For some Army training courses, completion of a certain academic course is prerequisite. For example, high school algebra is required for admission to the Field Artillery Operations and Intelligence Assistant Course. The present research provided opportunity to decermine empirically any unique predictive validity associated with completion of selected high school courses.

nos serkinistracción escribio, calebra conditión de condition de condi

As part of the experimental testing, examinees were asked to state whether they had taken certain high school courses: biology, chemistry, general science, electrical shop, hygiene, physics, earth science, algebra, woodworking, and metalworking. The yes-no responses were correlated with final course grades in each sample and beta weights computed. Years of education and age, obtained from official records, were also included in the validity analysis. The regression equations included—in addition to ten high school courses, age, and education—scores on the Arithmetic Reasoning and Automotive Information tests of the ACB and three interest scales from the Classification inventory—Electronics, Maintenance, and Attentiveness.

The mean beta weights indicated little unique validity for the courses, most coefficients being near zero (Table C-1). Although the validity coefficients for completion of the courses were positive, the beta weights were usually small, and about half were negative. Level of education or years of schooling completed was a valid predictor of training performance in most MOS groups. In previous research 1, it was found that level of education contributes to the validity of the ACB for selected groups of MOS. In the present research, level of education was found to be uniquely valid when both selected ACB tests and specific courses were included in the regression equations, as indicated by the high weights in Table 6. The positive weights mean that men with lower levels of education such as high school dropouts and younger men do less well in MOS training than their test scores indicate, while men with more education such as college graduates and older men do better in MOS training than would be expected from their test scores.

Maier, M.H. Effects of educational level on prediction of training success with the ACB. Technical Research Note 225. Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory. Arlington, VA. January 1971.

Table 5

VALIDITY OF NEW ACB COMPOSITES

MOS Group	Validity Coefficient of Composite	Maximum Validity Coefficient (33 variables)
CO (Combat	.53	.57
FA (Field Artillery)	.61	.74
EL (blectronics Repair)	.73	.76
OF (Operators and Food)	.45	.50
SC (Surveillance and Communications)	69.	. 744
MM (Mechanical Maintenance)	.74	.80
GM (General Maintenance)	89.	.73
CL (Clerical)	89*	.75
ST (Skilled Technical)	69*	.78
Mean	.65	.71

Table 6

MEAN BETA WEIGHTS OF LEVEL OF EDUCATION,
AGE, AND ARITHMETIC REASONING

(Weights abstracted from Table C-1)

MOS Group	Level of Education	Age		rithmetic Reasoning
CO (Combat)	.01 '	.0€		.20
FA (Field Artillery)	.23	.11	ı	.23
EL (Electronics Repair)	.07	.09		.18
OF (Operators and Food)	.06	.10		.03
SC (Surveillance and Communications)	.06	.03		.19
MM (Mechanical Maintenance)	.07	:.18	1	.13 ;
GM (General Maintenance)	.10	.16,		,.21
CL (Clerical)	.18	.05		.20
ST (Skilled Technical)	.17	.00		.17

EVALUATION OF THE NEW APTITUDE AREA SYSTEM

Reduction of Attrition

A major objective in developing a new aptitude area structure was to reduce attrition from Army training schools. The Taylor-Russell Tables were used to estimate the effect of the new system on failure rates. The average validity coefficient across MOS groups increased from .55 under the previous battery to .65 under the new. Assuming that 80 percent of an unselected group would successfully complete the typical Army training course and that 40 percent of the input is excluded from the typical course, then the failure rate, according to the Taylor-Russell Tables, is 9 percent. The observed failure rate of all Army trainees during calendar year 1969 was 8.5 percent; the assumptions therefore appear reasonable. With an increase in the average validity coefficient to .65, and making the same assumptions, the expected failure rate would be reduced to 7 percent, or by about 20 percent.

The model on which the Taylor-Russell Tables are built assumes a single predictor and a single criterion. The Army's differential classification system uses multiple predictors and criteria. The univariate model is not entirely appropriate, but can serve as a convenient guide to estimate effectiveness. A more appropriate model for estimating predictive effectiveness is based on computerized simulation of an input population and differential classification. Such a model was employed, and the results supported those found for the simple univariate approximation.

Simulated Evaluation of Performance

In the simulation runs, vectors of normal random deviates were generated and transformed by the ACB population convariance matrix to resemble scores from the Army enlisted population. Each vector represented the operational and experimental ACB scores of a randomly selected individual, plus level of education and age. Aptitude area scores were computed for each simulated individual or entity, and the entity was then assigned to a job opening. Allocation to job areas was done in such a way as to maximize the predicted criterion scores summed across all entities and job areas. Each job area was assigned a quota that equaled recent operational Army input to the job area. Thirty samples of 500 entities were

Taylor, H.C. and J.J. Russell. The relationship of validity coefficients to the practical effectiveness of tests in selection--discussion and tables. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 1939, 23, 565-578.

Niehl, Elizabeth and R.C. Sorenson. SIMPO-I entity model for deter mining the qualitative input of personnel policies. Technical Research Note 193. (AD 831 268). Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory. Arlington, VA. January 1968.

generated. The quotas are shown in Table D-1.

wind the second of the second production of the second second second second second second second second second

After the entities were assigned to the MOS groups, their expected performance was evaluated by computing predicted criterion scores using all 33 variables in the prediction equations. The mean predicted performance score was computed for each MOS group for the entities allocated to the area. This figure, called the allocation average, shows how much gain or loss in predicted performance was realized by allocating the men to jobs on the basis of aptitude area composites.

The statistics required to perform the simulation are presented in the Appendixes. Table A-1 presents the intercorrelation matrix of operational and experimental variables used to transform the normal deviates. Table D-1 presents the quotas for each MOS group. Table D-2 presents the beta weights of the 33 variables for each MOS group in the new system. The beta weights were used to obtain predicted criterion scores for each entity in its assigned job area.

Mean Levels of Predicted Ferformance. The results of the simulation runs are shown in Table 7. In the prior aptitude area system, eight aptitude area scores were computed for each entity and the entities were optimally allocated to one of eight job areas. Mean predicted criterion scores were obtained in each sample of 500 entities. The same entities were also allocated to one of nine job areas on the basis of the new aptitude area composites. Predicted criterion scores in the area of assignment were also computed from the regression equation of all 33 variables for that area. The mean predicted criterion scores were calculated for each job area under each assignment system. An overall man across job areas was also computed. The values shown in Table 7 are the mean predicted criterion scores under the two aptitude area systems.

The overall level of predicted performance was considerably higher under the new system, 104.6 for the new versus 102.6 for the previous system. If the men were assigned at random, without any prior knowledge of their skills and aptitudes, the average predicted performance would be 100. When aptitude scores are used in making assignments, the predicted performance is, of course, increased. The amount of increase is a complex function of several factors, including quotas (percentage of men assigned to each MOS group), number of MOS groups, and validity of the aptitude area scores—. The major source of the increase—4.6 points with the new system compared to 2.6 with the prior system—is undoubtedly the higher validity of the new composites, since the number of job areas was about the same, 9 versus 3, and the quotas in the job areas were of generally the same order.

Brogden, H.E. Efficiency and classification as a function of number of jobs, percent rejected, and the validity and intercorrelation of job performance estimates. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1959, 19, 181 - 190.

Table 7

MEAN PREDICTED CRITERION SCORES UNDER THE NEW APTITUDE AREA SYSTEM

AND UNDER THE PREVIOUS SYSTEM

Old Aptitude Area System		New Aptitude Area System			
MOS Group	Mean	MOS Group	Mean		
IN	100.0	со	103.1		
AE	99•7	FA	106.3		
EL	103.9	EL	106.5		
GM	98.3	OF	103.5		
MM	102.1	SC	107.7		
CL	101.6	ММ	105.5		
GT	109.0	GM	107.1		
RC	112.4	CL	103.6		
		ST	103.7		
Total	102.6	Total	104.6		

light shift the first factor of the second
Two of the MOS groups in the prior system, AE and GM, had mean predicted performance slightly below 100 (Table 7). The entities assigned to these two job groups were below average when all the information available about them contained in the 33 variables was taken into account. Two other areas, GT and RC, were substantially higher than the others. In the new system, all MOS groups had means above average, and all means were clustered from 103 to just under 108. Thus, the distribution of talent was more equitable across all MOS groups than it has been heretofore.

Gain from the New System. The absolute value of the increase in predicted performance cannot be interpreted directly because there is no score scale that can be readily applied to the mean values. However, the means can be interpreted relative to one another. The increase of 4.6

points over random assignment attained with the new system represents a 75 percent improvement over the 2.6 points increase under the prior system. It can then be said that the utility of the Army personnel classification and assignment system is increased 75 percent by converting to the new system.

The overall level of performance would be higher under the new system. Since the ACB is used to predict training success, the improved level of training performance can serve as a standard by which to evaluate the new ACB. In 1970, the median cost of putting a qualified worker in the field was about \$6,000, which includes the cost of procurement, basic combat training, and job training. A reasonable estimate for the combined cost of getting a man into the Army and putting him through basic combat training is about \$2,000. This leaves about \$4,000 as the median cost of providing job training to produce a worker qualified in an MOS. On the average, this approach seems reasonable, although individual cases vary widely around the average. The average man performs at a level that is worth as much as he costs to train; the below-average performer represents a net loss to the Army, since he performs at a level worth less than the cost of training him. The above-average men, following the same argument, is worth more than his training cost, and the Army gains.

One way of measuring the worth of performance is to use the Army standard scale and the training cost as a basis. On the Army standard score scale, the average level of performance is set at 100. The unsatisfactory man is defined as one with an expected performance at the level of 80. Expected performance from 80 to 100 covers the range from no net worth to an equal balance between cost and performance. Since 80 represents a total net loss, and the median training cost is \$4,000, the man with an expected performance of 80 is a loss of \$4,000 to the Army. As the scale of expected performance is ascended, the increased performance begins to offset the training cost until cost and performance are balanced at the average level of 100. Assuming a linear increase, each point increase between 80 and 100 worth \$4,000 divided by 20, or \$200.

The scale also extends to the positive side. Each point of the increased expected performance on the above-average side is also worth \$200. With the old ACB, the average expected performance was 2.5 points above what would be realized if the men were assigned on a chance basis, which assumes no knowledge of capability to perform. This gain means that the Army has been getting an extra \$500 worth of performance (2.5 r vints gain times \$200 for each point) per enlisted man because of the improved assignments. The new ACB and aptitude area system will add an additional 2 points to the average expected performance, or \$400 more the average above the gain already realized by the old system. per man input rate of 200,000 men per year, the gain of the new ACB over te old assumes rather large proportions. With the new ACB, the increased worth of training performance is \$400 per man; with 200,000 men, the Army each year would be getting \$80,000,000 increased worth of performance from enlisted men during their training assignment.

The 380,000,000 worth of increased performance is a net gain that can be realized by implementing the new ACB and aptitude area system. The increased performance will not result in an immediate corresponding reduction in the Army budget. It does mean, however, that for a fixed number of enlisted men, the overall quality of performance will be higher. As the Army manpower strength is reduced, each position becomes more important and the quality of each man's performance more critical.

Another way of looking at the increased productivity under the new system is that the number of superior performers would be increased by 15 percent and the number of marginal performers reduced by 20 percent. A superior performer is defined as an individual with predicted criterion performance of 110 or better on the Army standard score scale, and a marginal performer as one with predicted criterion performance of 90 or below. Table 8 presents the number of men expected to be marginal or superior performers under the two systems. The numbers are based on an input of 200,000 men.

The gains in performance expected from the new aptitude area system would be realized through improved assignments, and not through higher

Table 8

EXPECTED PERFORMANCE IN OLD AND NEW APTITUDE AREA SYSTEMS

(Based on input of 200,000 men)

Aptitude Area System	Marginal Performers	Superior Performers
01d	35,000	57 , 500
Nev	27,500	67,500
	20% decrease	15% increase

selection standards. In the simulation runs, exactly the same entities were assigned under each aptitude area system and their predicted performance was evaluated by the same set of variables (that is, all 33 predictors). The new composites are better measures of potential, and their operational use will result in fewer errors in assignment.

Weighting Tests in the Aptitude Area Composites. The simulation runs were also used to settle the question of the weights to assign the tests in each composite. From an operational point of view, the most desirable procedure is the simple addition of all tests in a composite. Maximum validity, however, is obtained when beta weights are used.

Several weighting schemes were evaluated to determine the loss in mean predicted performance when progressively simpler systems are used. The most effective system used the maximum amount of valid information about each individual in making assignments. Collecting and utilizing the information is expensive, however, and a tradeoff must be reached between cost of collecting and using information and its incremental utility. Costs and utility at the present state-of-the-art are best evaluated by expert judgment. Simulation runs can provide data on which to base judgments.

telegraphy of the second of th

The allocation averages for the different weighting schemes are presented in Table $^{\circ}$. The most valid, but most cumbersome scheme, was to use all 33 variables in each composite—the 11 operational tests, the 2° experimental tests, plus age and education. When the entities were assigned and evaluated by the full regression equations, the maximum allocation average, 107.5, was obtained. However, such a complex weighting scheme would be too difficult to be used routinely in the field. One simplification was to drop 15 tests that did not emerge in the test selections, as well as age and education—variables which were in effect assigned weights of zero in the assignment process. The beta weights for the remaining 16 tests were used in computing the composite scores. For this weighting scheme, the allocation average was about 105.9, a drop of 1.6 points below the maximum.

The composites were further simplified through test selection to the test content presented in Table 4. The question of what weights to assign the component tests remained. Three options were evaluated: 1) weights closely approximating the beta weights obtained in test selection; 2) simple weights of 1, 2, or 3, roughly approximating the beta weights; and 3) unit weights, for which the size of the beta weights was not considered. The three allocation averages were virtually the same: 104.63, 104.64, and 104.55, respectively. The simplified composite resulted in a drop in the allocation average from 105.9 for the full beta-weighted composites

Soreson, R.C. Optimal allocation of enlisted men-full regression equations vs aptitude area scores. Technical Research Note 163. (AD (24). Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory, Arlington, VA. November 1969.

Table 9

MEAN PREDICTED CRITERION SCORES WITH ASSIGNMENTS
MADE BY DIFFERENT WEIGHTING SCHEMES

Weighting Scheme	Mean Score
Beta weights, 33 variables	107.46
Beta weights, 16 variables (New ACB)	105.87
Complex weights, New Composites	104.63
Simple weights, New Composites	104.64
Unit weights, New Composites	104.55

of 16 variables to about 104.6 for the unit-weighted composites of 3 to 5 tests each. The operational convenience of using a reduced number of variables in each composite was judged worth the loss of increased productivity that would result from the full equations. The more complex composites would be more difficult to compute--and also more difficult to interpret. For this reason, their use might be resisted by some operating personnel. The decision was to propose for operational use the simplest composites, inasmuch as the procedure did not reduce the allocation average below an acceptable level.

Selection of Men with Marginal Mental Ability

and this is the contract of the contract of the contract of the contract of the state of the state of the contract of the cont

An important operational concern about the new composites is their effect on the selection of marginal men. Marginal men are defined as those having percentile scores 10 through 30 on the Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT), a test of general mental ability used for mental screening. Two factors are used to determine mental qualification of marginal men: level of education and number of aptitude area scores at or above 90. Under mental standards of the late 1960's, non-high school graduates who scored 10-15 on the AFQT had to have two aptitude area scores of 90 or better; nongraduates who scored 16-30 had to have one aptitude area score of 90 or better. Nongraduates who scored 10 or above on the AFQT but failed to meet the aptitude area requirements were

placed in Trainability Limited Category 1-Y. All high school graduates who scored 10 or above were mentally qualified for Army service. The aptitude area scores used to determine mental qualifications were based on the Army Qualification Battery (AQB), a series of short test corresponding to tests of the Army Classification Battery and administered at Armed Forces Entrance and Examining Stations.

The new composites are more difficult than the prior composites in that more marginal men fail to get qualifying aptitude area scores of ∞ . The new composites have a heavier weight of general mental ability than the previous composites, and they contain more tests in each composite, three to five instead of two. These two conditions mean that some inductees who under the old system met the mental standards then in effect would fail to do so under the new \mathbb{L} .

To find what effect the new composites would have on the distribution of aptitude area scores among the men given preinduction examinations, additional simulation studies were conducted. Simulation runs were made separately for each AFQT decile beginning at 21-30 and going through 91-99 and for the AFQT score ranges 10-15 and 16-20. Since the aptitude area scores used for mental qualification are based on the AQB, the AQB variance-covariance matrix and AQB composites were used. The AQB variance-covariance is presented in Table D-3. To obtain estimates of how the proportion of qualified men differs under the old and new systems, both sets of scores were generated for all men. Level of education was also included in the simulation runs. Based on other data available in BESRL, the proportion of high school graduates in a representative input group was about .75, which converts to a standard normal deviate of about .7. When the normal deviates were transformed to have means of 100 and standard deviations of 20, all entities with education scores above 86 were called high school graduates, and those with education scores of 86 and below were called nongraduates. Separate counts of aptitude area scores at or above 90 were obtained for graduates and nongraduates.

One reason more men of low general mental ability are unqualified under the new system is that more tests are included in each composite. The prior system tended to capitalize on the men's two highest scores to determine qualification. The rest of the test scores have been ignored. In computing the new composites, these lower scores are included, and the effect is to decrease the highest composite scores. Many men would therefore be shifted from the qualified to the unqualified category. A second reason for lowered scores is that the Arithmetic Reasoning Test (AR) is part of most of the new composites. Since AR has one of the highest coefficients of correlation with AFQT of any of the AQB tests, men with low AFQT scores would tend to have lower scores on AR than on other tests.

The population variance-covariance matrix of aptitude area composites, years of education, and AFQT was used to generate scores in each AFQT score level shown in Table D-4. The population matrix was restricted in range by using AFQT as the explicit selector and reducing the standard deviation of AFQT from the population value of 25.9 to 2.9 for each decile above 20, 1.4 for the 5-point range 16-20, and 1.7 for the 6-point range 10-15. The mean for each composite and education in the various AFQT score ranges was regressed by the formula:

$$\widetilde{X} = \overline{X} + b (A-50)$$

where A = midpoint of AFQT score interval

5C = AFQT population mean

b = regression weight for predicting variable X from AFQT

X = population mean of variable

The same entities were generated for each AFQT score range, except that the mean scores changed; the variance-covariance matrices remained identical except for different degrees of restriction on AFQT.

Nongraduates have had to attain qualifying scores on one or two AQB composites, not including RC (Radio Code). The Army Radio Code Aptitude Test, called Auditory Perception in the new ACB, has not been part of the Army Qualification Battery and is not expected to be included in the AQB under the new system. The SC (Surveillance and Communications) composite in the new system and the RC (Radio Code) composite in the prior system were omitted from the present simulations, since the radio code test score enters into both composites.

The distribution of number of aptitude area scores at or above 90 achieved by marginal men is shown in Table 10. From these data, estimates of the increased number of nongraduates who fail to qualify on the AQB composites can be obtained. Some entities that have no aptitude area scores of 90 or better under the new system had one, two, or even three scores of 90 or better under the prior system. The converse was not true: An entity who had no aptitude area score of 90 under the old system usually has no 90 scores under the new system.

The distribution of aptitude area scores presented in Table 10 is based on AQB composites. The distribution of aptitude area scores of 90 or better for the entire AFQT range of 10 and above is shown in Table 11. Most men with AFQT scores above 30 can be expected to qualify on at least one aptitude area, and usually on more than one, although 14 percent of nongraduates in AFQT range 31-40 do not have any aptitude area scores of 90. Men with no scores of 90 or better are considered unqualified for almost all Army MOS training courses. As a rule, special consideration must be given them in making assignments.

Table 10

DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF AQB APTITUDE AREA SCORES AT OR ABOVE 90 FOR MEN IN MENTAL CATEGARY IV

		Total 41 19 13 27 100	Total 32 17 13 38 100	Total 19 14 12 55 100
		33 33	427 455	647794 447794
pe	nde	200402	273872	136365
Combined	Old Aptitudo Area System	15 2 3 26 26	11 22 23 21 23	12223
S	01d Area	14 1 1 19	0 8 2 1 1	0 6 1 0 0 2
		0 2 3 Total	0 1 2 3+ Total	0 1 2 3+ Total
·		Total 52 19 13 16	Total 44 17 14 25 100	Total 28 17 15 40 100
uates		3+ 5 6 6 11 28	3, 6 7 7 39	33 56 56
Græð	3 E	23 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	10 10 5 4 4	20 20 20
hoo1	Old Aptitude Area System	1 18 5 2 2 27	1 15 4 2 2 2 23	1 3 2 2 16
gh Sc	old A Area	0 3 1 0 24	0 13 2 1 1 16	0 1 1 0 8
Non-High School Graduates		0 1 2 3 ⁷ Total	0 1 2 3+ Total	0 1 2 3 ⁺ Total
		Total 32 18 13 37 100	Total 24 16 13 47 100	Total 13 12 11 64 100
S e S		35 50 30 30 30	3+ 6 6 35 51	3+ 4 4 5 6 7 0
aduates	ے و	2 7 4 8 23	2 2 3 2 3	2 3 3 17
11 14	titud ystem	112 6 4 24	1 4 2 3 19	1 2 2 10
High School G	Old Aptitude Area System	0^{1} 10^{3} 1 1 1 1	877770	300150
ligh	0 4	2 0 1 2 2 3+ Total	0 1 2 2 3 ⁺ Total	0 1 2 3+ Total
#	9	New ptitude Area System	New Aptitude Area System	New Aptitude Area
	AFQT Score	10-15	16-20	21-30

Note 1Row and column headings refer to number of scores at or above 90, 3+ includes all numbers of 3 and above. 2Army Qualification Battery (AQB) composites used in computations. 3Cell entries are percentages

Table 11

DISTRIBUTION OF NUMBER OF NEW APTITUDE AREA SCORES AT OR ABOVE 90 FOR FULL RANGE OF MENTAL ABILITY

	ž	Non-High School Graduates	Hig	r. Š	cho	01 (Gra	dua	tes	% of Non-grads	High School Graduates	ı Sc	; hoc) [C	ïrac	dua (es.		% of					ť	Total				
	~	Number of Aptitude Area Scores at or above 90	ber	of sal	iumber of Aptitude Ascores at or above	tıtı ral	ude bov	Are e 90	еа 0	in AFQT score	Number of Aptitude Area Scores at or above 90	er c	of A at	Apt i or	ltuc abc	Aptitude Are or above 90	Area 90	cri	in AFQT score	çı	Num	ber ore	of s	AP to	tit ra	Number of Aptitude Area Scores at or above 90	Are 90	e	
ÁFQI Score	0	1	2	3	4	5	9	7	80		0	1 2	"	4		9 9	'`	8 /			0		7	6	4	2	9	1	∞
10-15	52	52^2 19 13	13	9	5	Э	1	1	0	45	$32^{2}18$	3 13	3 11	1	,`	. 5	(*)	3 1	55		41,2	19	13	0	7	5	3	7	-
16-20	77		17 14 10	10	9	2	7	2	-	07	24 16	5. 13	11	11	6 1			.n	09		32	17	ជ	11	6	7	s	4	7
21-30	28		17 15 12	2	8	7	5	4	3	36	13 12	=	12	21 7	11	[]]	10	6	99		19	7.	12	77	11	10	6	8	7
31-40	14	*	2	ដ	13 12 10	10	6	6	7	30	7 6		6	6	12	2 14	16	5 23	7.		7	8	6	10	10	11	12]	14 1	19
41-50	5	7	6	10	9 10 11 12 14 14	12	14	14	17	25	1 2	4	w1			9 12	2 19	9 41	75		7	4	5	9	7	21	1 3 1	17 3	35
51-60	7	7	5	7		11	8 11 15 18	18	32	20	0 1	7		4	9	6	18	3 60	80		-	-	7	က	4	^	10	18 5	54
61-70	7	F	7	n	5	œ	11	11 21	67	16	0	0	_		ری	2	13	3 76	84		0	0		-	2	4	6	14 7	72
71-80	0	0	-	7	7	4	œ	19	99	13	0	0	٠	0	-1	- 2		9 87	87		0	0	0	0	-	-	3	10 8	85
81-90	0	0	0	0	-	7	n	14	80	10	0 0	0	0	0	٠	1	4 !	5 94	06		0	0	0	0	0	0	_	5	93
91-100	0	0	0	0	0	_	7	2 10	87	7	0	0	0	0	0	0		2 98	93		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6

Note 1 ACB composites used for AFQT deciles of 31.40 and above, AQB composites used for AFQT range 10-30.

2 Cell entries show percentage of men in each AFQT score range with specified number of aptitude area scores at or above 90.

As long as aptitude area scores are used as screening standards, the increased difficulty of obtaining aptitude area scores of 90 or better has implications for personnel procurement. More men in mental Category IV would need to be examined under the new system to obtain a specified number of qualified men. The severity of the problem depends on other factors, such as quotas for men in this range of ability, educational requirements, and size of the available manpower pool. On the average, men qualifying under the new system will have higher levels of general ability and can be expected to adapt better to Army life.

CONCLUSION

In sum, the new Army Classification Battery and aptitude area system were found to be superior to the previous system. The average validity of the new aptitude area composites across all MOS is higher than that of the previous composites. Through simulation runs, the new measures were found to result in higher levels of predicted performance to be achieved by identical sample inputs. In the simulations, exactly the same men were assigned by both the old and the new ACB; the gain could therefore be realized without keeping more underqualified men out of the Army.

While the new system makes it slightly more difficult for men in the lower mental categories to achieve the one or more aptitude area scores of 90 or higher requisite to assignment to MOS training, the men who do qualify are more likely to experience success in the Army. This result is particularly important in considering a modern volunteer Army, in all probability much reduced in size. Under those conditions, it would be more critical that each space be filled by a man with high likelihood of filling it competently. Accurate assessment of aptitude at time of entry becomes even more important and mistakes in overestimating potential more costly. The new composites provide better qualified men for Army jobs because with the more accurate measurement of capabilities job assignments can be better matched to the men's aptitudes and interests.

LITERATURE CITED

- 1. Brogden, H. E. Efficiency of classification as a function of number of jobs, percent rejected, and the validity and intercorrelation of job performance estimates. <u>Educational and Psychological Measurement</u>, 1959, 19, 181-190.
- 2. Maier, M. H. Procedures for assigning grades to failures and turn-backs in Army school courses. Technical Research Note 197. (AD 833 582). Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory, Arlington, VA. April 1968.
- 3. Maier, M. H. Effects of educational level on prediction of training success with the ACB. Technical Research Note 225. Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory, Arlington, VA. June 1972.
- 4. Maier, M. H. and E. F. Fuchs. Development of improved aptitude area composites for enlisted classification. Technical Research Report 1159. (AD 831 268). Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory, Arlington, VA. September 1969.
- 5. Maier, M. H. and E. F. Fuchs. An Improved Differential Army Classification System. Technical Research Report 1177. Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory, Arlington, VA. April 1972.
- 6. Niehl, Elizabeth and R. C. Sorenson. SIMPO-I entity model for determining the qualitative input of personnel policies. Technical Research Note 193. (AD 831 268). Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory, Arlington, VA. January 1968.
- 7. Sorenson, R. C. Optimal allocation of enlisted men-full regression equations vs aptitude area scores. Technical Research Note 163. (AD 625 224). Behavior and Systems Research Laboratory, Arlington, VA. November 1965.
- 8. Summerfield, A. and A. Lubin. A square root method of selecting a minimum set of variables in multiple regression. <u>Psychometrika</u>, 1951, <u>16</u>, 271-284.
- 9. Taylor, H. C. and J. J. Russell. The relationship of validity coefficients to the practical effectiveness of tests in selection discussion and tables. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u>, 1939, 23, 565-578.

APPENDIXES

Appendi	x		Page
Α.	Table A-1.	Intercorrelations of experimental variables and operational ACB tests	32
В.	Table B-1.	Mean and standard deviation of validity coefficients for occupational areas	33
	B-2.	Mean and standard deviation of validity coefficient for Career Management Fields	34
	B-3.	Beta weights of test selected in first round of test selections	36
	B-4.	Beta weights of test selected in second round of test selections	37
	B- 5.	Beta weights of test selected in final round of test selections	38
	B-6.	Mean and standard deviation of validity coefficients for MOS groups: Part 1, ACB tests; Part 2, Non-ACB tests	39
	в-7.	Mean and standard deviation of beta weights for 33 variables by MOS group	41
	в-8.	Beta weights for proposed Army Classification Battery by MOS group	43
	C-1.	Mean and standard deviation of beta weights for high school courses and selected variables by MOS group	44
	D-1.	Quotas for old and new aptitude area system MOS groups	4 5
	D-2.	Beta weights for operational and experimental tests	46
	p-3.	Intercorrelations of old and new Army Qualification Battery aptitude area composites	4 8
	D-4.	Intercorrelation of new Army Classification	, 40

Table A-1

INTERCORRELATIONS OF EXPERIMENTAL VARIABLES AND OPERATIONAL ACB TESTS (D-CIMAL POINTS OMITTED)

Ш	1																																	- 1
	23	53	3 6	3	e :	7	34	21	17	28	97	42	43	91	56	- 7	43	27	32	38	51	33	18	19	3	21	31	54	-	39	35	31	8	4
:	ΥD	53	2 €	5	53	7	32	61	13	19	22	28	70	15	20	7	54	19	20	28	33	23	15	1	53	53	22	15	-5	23	54	8	3	요
	TI	26	2	7	63	78	35	9	29	62	36	61	30	9	88	30	21	23	22	9	48	62	37	45	20	67	63	75	19	52	8	54	35	£
	0	43	£ (/7	57	53	54	=	•	22	30	53	32	9	45	91-	25	30	53	31	70	33	15	13	88	77	30	45	-16	8	25	23	39	28
	z	7	3 :	:	2	÷	o	21	22	14	35	2	e.	56	13	40	-10	4	11	13	٠,	91	11	28	=	4	13	25	100	-16	19	-5	-7	7
	X	53	52	2	6	13	15	Ξ	œ	20	30	22	81	6	87	6	34	13	27	25	7	25	16	18	20	36	26	100	25	45	22	13	24	2
		97	4 0	7	26	22	50	5.	87	79	53	84	23	51	41	56	18	18	69	29	97	7,4	07	33	8	23	901	56	13	3	63	22	31	2
	ž	7.7	7 9	3	28	37	41	43	33	24	39	63	43	38	33	7	38	22	26	62	62	61	28	53	67	901	57	36	4	77	67	53	51	2
	Z.	97	5	9	24	34	38	42	33	44	28	43	36	0,7	28	13	22	18	43	28	25	20	2	53	100	64	20	20	=	28	20	59	31	ဆ
	×	23	52	77	35	11	18	41	94	37	35	33	14	77	27	20	18	32	31	37	54	36	21	100	56	53	33	18	28	13	45	15	19	=
	-	21	52	97	32	5	17	32	34	35	25	56	15	33	30	32	15	23	38	34	53	45	901	21	30	28	40	91	17	15	37	15	18	6
	-	25	05-	, 100	26	56	32	67	95	63	32	25	30	87	77	21	22	21	69	61	99	100	77	36	20	61	14	52	2	33	62	23	37	16
	Ě	19	80	Š	S	77	77	34	23	77	32	20	96	52	35	7	34	52	43	26	100	96	53	57	25	62	94	56	ŗ	70	87	33	51	13
	ž	85	, 50 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	ş	9	32	70	25	8	57	36	98	36	Ş	34	22	25	23	23	100	26	19	34	37	28	62	29	25	15	31	99	28	38	ا ۾
	E	S :	ψ, (7	25	22	53	45	77	58	28	84	56	21	70	56	22	21	100	27	43	69	38	31	43	26	69	27	11	53	23	50	32	1.4
	×	28	56	7	19	56	20	15	14	18	37	57	23	15	27	17	51	100	21	23	25	21	23	32	18	27	18	19	4	30	23	19	77	ا ۵
	ర	43	9 6	07	18	36	27	9	7	14	32	27	38	-	34	-13	100	51	22	25	34	22	15	18	22	38	18	34	-10	52	21	54	43	61
	8	7-	;	71	ຊ	7-	7	37	47	53	23	11	-10	97	21	100	-13	17	56	22	~	21	32	S	13	7	56	6	9	-10	30	7	-1	ņ 1
	8	27	35	87	78	7	23	50	14	33	34	25	25	50	100	21	34	27	40	34	35	77	30	27	53	33	41	87	13	45	28	20	56	2
	ပ	53	53	4	25	Ξ	16	63	9	54	24	77	6	100	20	95	~	15	51	21	25	84	33	77	40	38	51	6	56	9	9	15	16	=
	(2-,	87	65	7	32	25	41	17	14	22	23	39	100	6	25	- 10	38	23	56	36	26	30	15	14	36	43	23	18	۳-	32	30	70	43	2
	5	65	27	9	28	36	41	51	51	53	41	100	39	77	25	17	27	54	48	98	20	25	56	33	43	63	87	22	01	53	61	28	42	13
	ප	٠,	34	7	35	27	27	31	25	32	100	41	23	57	34	23	32	37	28	36	32	32	25	32	28	39	53	30	15	30	36	22	56	٠
	ıu	47	3 !	7	29	54	58	99	57	901	32	53	22	24	33	53	14	18	28	23	42	63	35	37	77	24	79	20	14	22	62	19	28	=
	¥	34	٠ د	?	26	14	22	63	001	57	25	21	14	9	14	25	7	14	77	20	27	97	34	97	33	39	84	9	22	9	29	13	17	72
	Δ	0,7	8 6	3	28	22	27	100	63	98	31	51	17	63	20	37	9	15	45	25	34	67	32	41	75	43	51	11	21	11	9	19	21	ا ه
	AP	47	χ, τ	7	41	75	100	27	22	28	27	41	41	19	21	7	27	50	58	07	75	32	17	18	38	41	59	15	0	57	35	32	34	5
	ပ	87	£ 5	ŝ	32	8	75	22	17	57	27	36	52	11	21	7	36	97	22	32	1,1	56	15	17	34	37	22	15	٠,	53	28	41	41	6
	1	24			_																													l
	< .	67	·																															
	AR	နှင့်	8 :	ç	55	87	85	38	35	77	34	57	65	29	32	1	07	56	45	28	99	20	25	25	53	6,	77	25	ţ	38	53	32	47	13
	ž	8	90	4	24	43	47	40	34	47	38	9	8,7	6.	27	7-	43	28	20	28	19	24	21	23	95	7.7	95	53	7	73	59	29	23	62
	VAR	¥	¥.	~	6 0	ပ	٧b	۵	ΑΙ	m	ဗ	CI	íŁ	Ü	Œ	દ	ర	æ	EI	¥	ž	-	۲,	¥	PA	¥	יי	Σ	z	0	ΤΙ	Ψ	ED	A C

Variable Tables			
WK Word Knowledge	E Electronics Information (Old)	H General Adjustment	L. Electronic Picture Test
AR Arithmetic Reasoning	CC Combat Interest	El Electronics Information (New	M Biological interest
A Pattern Analysis (Old)	Gl General Information	MC Mechanical Comprehension	N Construction Interests
B Mechanical Aptitude	F Subtraction and Division	MK Mathematics Knowledge	O General Job Interests
C Clerical Speed	G Tool Knowledge	+ science	TI Trade Information
AP Auditory Perception	CE Electronics Interest	J Electronics Inventory (High)	AD Attention to Detail
D Shop Mechanics	CM Mechanical Interest	K Electronics Inventory (Low)	ED Years of Education
Al Automotive Information	CA Attentiveness Interest	PA Pattern Analysis (New)	AG Age
		SK Science Knowdedge	

APPENDIX B

Table B-1

MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF VALIDITY COEFFICIENTS FOR OCCUPATIONAL AREAS (Decimal Points Omitted)

								1															1	ļ	1	1	-							•
MOS Group	F	ŋ	8	₹	ర	x	#4	¥C	ž	1	•	×	≴	¥s	נו	Z	0	i i	₹	8	¥	*	A A		m ≺	v	ä	۵	¥	10	ខ	ឌ	No. of Samples	1
	Α.	Mean		Validity	Coef	Coefficients	nts																											ı
	600 800 800 800 800 800 800 800 800 800	29 42 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43 43		6 11 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	25 27 33 31 38 36 40 37 37 39	25 26 26 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	27 36 52 55 55 48 47 47	633 633 647 647 647 647 647	50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 5	38 55 53 55 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54 54	250 11 12 12 13 13 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	23 22 23 24 24 25 25 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27	41 44 449 447 447 443 443 441 441	55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55 55	25 2 2 2 2 2 3 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	111 11 12 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13	23 23 32 34 34 35 36 37 37 37	600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600 600	30 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37 37	27 45 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47	23 2 2 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	6 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	25 23 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	25 33 33 40 40 33 40 40 33 40 40 33 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 40	264242424	32 6 6 7 7 7 3 8 8 8 8 9 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	30 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	32 23 3 3 3 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 23 2	0.0000000000000000000000000000000000000		
	8, 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	Stan 2 2 10 10 7 7 7 7 10 8 8 8 8	Standard 2 6 10 12 10 10 17 12 8 9 7 23 7 23 18 19 19 24 19 24 8 13	Deviation of Validity Coeffic 13 4 2 6 4 6 9 18 11 14 15 17 10 7 6 11 9 12 11 9 14 10 7 11 12 16 11 9 12 13 12 8 10 9 8 10 10 10 14 13 15 11 10 15 14 14 13	1t ton 4 18 9 7 9 10 12 12 10	of V. 111 110 110 88 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	6 110 10 10 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	ty Co	effic 6 17 12 11 11 11 11 12 13 8	Fe 12 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	12 12 13 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	2 1 1 2 2 8 8 2 1 1 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	7 111 111 12 14 16 10 10 15	88 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	7 6 8 8 8 8 8 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	6 16 16 17 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	7 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	22 20 21 8 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	2 2 3 6 6 7 7 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8	6 5 5 7 7 7 5 5 6 8	13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 1	7 7 9 9 1 1 1 1 7 7 1 8	2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	7 4 7 8 8 8 5 E 8 5 5 7 7 7 7 8 8 8 7 E 8 7 5 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	~ * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	447000000000	22 8 7 8 7 II 6 8 2 I 8	111 2 2 2 2 3 8 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	112 112 113 114 111		8 H v o x u s v u H u		

Proble A 1 for test titles

2Row Labels

1 infantry Combat (IN)

2 Missle and Fire Contol Electronics Maintenance (EL)

3 General Electronics Maintenance (EL)

4 Precision Maintenance (GM) Note

5 Auxiliary Services (GM)
5 Motors (MM)
7 Cerces (CL)
3 Graphics (GT)
9 General Technical (GT)
0 Radio Code (RC)

Part 1 Table B-2

MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF VALIDITY COEFFICIENTS POR CAREER MANAGEMENT FIELDS (Decimal points Omitted)

No. of Samples

ដ ႘

¥ ۵

¥ v

¥ š

¥c

2

40

F

0

x

-1

×

ž

ž ž

H

ర

હ

뜅

Career Management Fleid

	•	-	~		2	4	2	4	9		~	~	•	•	~	~		•	~			•••	~	-	
	ñ	34	4 5	7.9	3	25	S	3	\$	42	2	94	7	2	4	74	19	36	9	69	55	25	36	61	47
	53	22	28	67	23	5 8	58	3	34	30	3	20	34	53	5 0	23	33	31	33	37	33	35	2	28	34
	36	32	39	65	44	3	23	2	55	46	စ္တ	32	ŝ	36	40	33	46	4 0	87	42	20	45	25	38	39
	20	33	53	34	38	39	Ç	53	2	34	47	6 3	ž	53	31	23	33	32	61	27	23	33	5	21	41
	37	5 6	2	45	ž	36	7	3	Š	33	77	5 6	54	28	32	27	39	30	34	38	38	9	20	32	39
	33	36	34	23	35	20	38	33	33	61	32	33	43	ę,	64	9	47	77	33	41	3	4	23	47	2
	53	53	39	42	36	70	37	33	32	13	33	53	7 0	43	36	40	2	42	13	34	¢3	41	28	26	23
	77	38	77	S	77	25	2	52	3 6	33	8	35	63	42	46	39	62	44	8 3	45	S	ĸ	22	44	43
	37	33	41	20	43	53	63	45	45	32	67	27	26	39	97	37	Ş	77	32	37	67	ဝွ	13	36	ęş
	43	47	55	72	5	67	S	61	25	43	9	35	Ş	62	55	9	75	62	8	73	9	61	ရ	89	44
	38	45	67	65	87	63	S	53	21	33	ŝ	39	7	65	2	ş	73	63	5	32	57	6	H	68	34
	22	13	36	43	5 6	52	18	20	28	7	77	:	15	35	56	2	23	27	23	00	31	56	11	5	18
	31	33	2	25	35	41	39	46	70	33	26	30	97	25	6 3	45	Ş.	77	34	47	21	45	53	61	35
	31	34	52	45	34	56	58	17	22	32	37	æ	53	33	33	31	34	38	'n	5 6	8	34	20	17	57
	75	21	43	62	87	ş	22	51	62	46	61	43	99	45	47	77	2	3	79	::	25	S	32	61	43
	20	59	32	S 6	33	35	34	27	56	12	43	18	36	38	35	27	77	53	91	21	25	27	91	20	a)
	9	13	7-	-15	•	23	01	21	20	53	71	9	21	7	9	-	21	•	61	-33	-33	6 0	12	32	=
																				-15	-				
	32	32	42	75	97	3	51	5	25	33	52	56	57	34	41	34	25	34	23	53	23	45	21	70	40
	9	48	47	63	67	55	21	51	26	87	57	37	62	28	48	47	62	55	57	52	65	63	53	99	33
	39	36	37	9	33	55	47	52	47	25	53	28	9	38	47	34	57	38	21	39	57	Š	18	38	46
	25	36	28	30	21	25	37	32	47	36	23	32	45	=	53	12	18	22	3	-20	18	£,	17	33	33
																			•	45					
	35	35	1 43	5 73	. 47	8 49	54	. 59	ç	47	53	34	1 63	643	43	37	55	63	45	39	. 61	2	2	87	41
	Ë	ñ	Š	ĕ	3	3	×	š	'n	ž	ĕ	ĕ	×	ž	3	20	×	S	×	š	9	9	=	9	3
_	77	37	47	68	51	61	57	Ş	57	70	79	38	65	97	57	£3	59	42	24	45	41	26	8	57	25
Mean Validity Coefficients	28	36	77	68	77	S	52	61	55	41	2	23	26	42	36	35	47	38	87	45	20	20	61	51	43
effic	97	32	56	27	19	 	56	56	56	30	21	20	33	28	56	56	32	30	35	1	28	54	82	13	71
S	56	38	32	9	27	38	31	31	53	34	36	8	34	77	30	*	9	43	77	41	25	32	23	28	12
11416	11	18	=	'n	2	7	21	20	34	53	9	18	37	-10	4	-2	6	7	7	-25	-1	7	œ	7	13
n Va	18	52	53	58	53	37	43	51	92	30	77	12	33	23	32	21	77	17	4-	-23	23	53	œ	33	25
¥e3																				-16					
¥.	33	32	3	38	32	25	35	9	36	21	8	33	74	51	45	45	23	25	97	0,0	35	4	11	87	35
	₂ 1 8	CO 5	FA 3	4	Š	SC 6	EL 7	EL 8	ě	GM10	GHI	OF12	£13	G.1 4	SC15	CL16	ST17	CL 18	GM19	ST20	ST21	ST22	0723	ST 24	51. 25

Part 2 Table B-2

Career													İ																			11
Management Field	nt F	ပ	25	3	ే	æ	El	Ž	¥	p=4	•	×	PA S		Z.	~	0	F	4	2	Ş	š	\$	<	•	v	e,	۰ م	Y.	0	မ	5
n	œ.	Sta	Standard	Devi	Deviation of	Jo	/a11d	Validity Coeff	-	clert																						ı
7 E S	91 1	7 7 7	° 2 2	2 - 2		ν ~ α	5 T C	4 Q ā			รสร	๛ ค รู	~ ~ ;	9 <u>9 9</u>	20	22	e 2	L 4	2 2	6 7	9 7	9 2	s 51	~ 0	25							60 ⊲
SC 6 EL 7	3 2 2	9 5	. ~ 2	3 27 °		2.		3 4 0	9 = :									2 80	22	7 6	9 9 9	8 5	70	25		21 6	33.	15 1	22.0	24		n
EL 8	m :	00	٠,	12		, ~	. 80	~ ~										∞ ∢	7 01	91 ^	25	• "	~ ~	•								•
É	2 =	2v vv	= =	6 7		ខ្ល	:: °	== 8										· 00 0	: C :	· # :	:21	' =:	7	ם ב								~ •
0F12	E1 ~	 ~	=======================================	۲.		01:	~ 0	'n										7 V	*	22	n co	4 ~	= ~	ው ሳ								4 -
77.75) Q	9	2 2	7		م ل	7 1	7 ~										so e	~ •	۲:	∢;	•	~	•								. ~
SC15 CL16	٥٥	Ś	۷ ۷	21 «	00 v	٠ 4	90 r	٠ ٠ ٠										ο •	0 4	. 6	22	~ 80	0 0	e n								~ 4
CL18	1	, ao	` =	2		° 01) I	٦ (æ ;	•	-	ជ	4	4	•								· ~
ST22	12	•	S	7		0	~	^	. ~									2 a	: '	3 ;	2:	n (m :	~ (4
0F23	18	m	12	m		11	•	91	0									۰ م	N 64	7 4	3 0	> 00	12	P 21								• •
																											l					ı
Note: 1 See Table A-1 for test titles.	Teble A	1 for the	st titles																													

2 Combit Engineering
2 Combit Engineering
3 Field Centron & Rocket Artillery
4 Field Artillery-Missiles (OF & EL)
5 Aur Defense (OF & EL)
6 Combit Surveillance & Target Acquisition
7 Tactical Encronic Equipment
Maintenance
8 Fixed Plant Communications Equipment
Maintenance

18 Supply
19 Petroleum
20 Topography & Printing
21 Information Audio Visual
22 Medical
22 Food Service
24 Military Intelligence
25 Special Assignment

BETA WEIGHTS OF TESTS SELECTED IN FIRST ROUND OF TEST SELECTIONS (Decimal points omitted) Table B-3

Bentontysian (equal procedure) of the control of th

	CE CM CA H CC M N O AP Samples	24 11 (R. 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17 17	-43 T (N 94)
	1 61	13 22 13	., "
	SK		26 24 23
	. PA		24
	×	13	
Beta Weights	r,	- 26	
Se ta	1		
	13	25	13
	in.	-36 -18 18 14	
	C AB	11 11 11 11 11 11 12 14	
		13 12 13 13 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	17
	1 v 9	27 28 2 2 3 11 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	
	TI .	19 29 2 28 2 28 18 2 18 17	2
	MC 1		23
	m	34	13
	¥	22 16 22 20 28	23
	* \	18 27 27 19 51 29 29 29 29 29	18
	¥	23 30 23 24 24 24 24 25	
	Career Management Field	IN/AR' COME PCRA AD CSTA TEEM TEEM CONST CHEW MTRP AIRM ADM COOP SUPP	INAV MEDI FOOD

Note 1 See Table A 1 for test titles 2 See Table B 2 for full titles of Career Management Fields

Table B-4

terbook between the extension of the survey of a property of the state

BETA WEIGHTS OF TESTS SELECTED IN SECOND ROUND OF TEST SELECTIONS (Decimal points omitted)

	AP	111 12 22 23 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	12
	IJ	12	
	5	22 12 13 11 11 14	
	퓽	25	
	CE	12 26 26	
	19	20 21 21 21 18 118	;
	н	11 11 20 19	
	SK	23	24
	PA	13 15 16 20	
	EI	25 25	15
ights	ĹĿ	10 14 14 14	
Beta Weights	ΑD	14 16 11 11 11 14	
æ	AI	13 16 14 30 31 31	
	ၓ	54	
	II	19 30 13 18 18 18	
	MC MC	22 17 21 81	
	秦	23 23 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21 21	23
	AR	18 17 24 31 27 27 17 17 11 24 30 25 25	17
	WK	07 19 38 21 24 24	
	Career Management Field	IN/AR ² COME FCRA AD (Repair) TEEM FPCE AD (Oper) MTRF COOP COOP MEMA AIRM AIRM ADM FINA SUPP	MEDI

Note: 1 See Table A-1 for test titles.

2 See Table B-2 for full titles of Career Management Fields.

Table B-5

BFTA WEIGHTS OF TESTS SELECTED IN FINAL ROUND OF TEST SELECTIONS (Decimal points omitted)

				Bet	Beta Weights	ghts										Ī
MOS Group	AR	WK	GI	Æ	SK	ET	TI	MC	AI	PA	AP	AD	ខ	క	뜅	吾
CO (Combat) FA (Field Artillery) EL (Electronics Repair) OF (Operators and Food) SC (Surveillance and Communications) MM (Mechanical Maintenance) GM (General Maintenance) CL (Clerical) ST (Skilled Technical)	19 24 25 23 23 31 31	16	12 27	22 26 25	24	13 19 15	21 17 19	18 16 18	17 24 21	11 11	18	11	12	09 15	81	16

Note 1 See Table A-1 for test titles

Table B-6 Part 1

THE PERSON OF THE PERSON AND PROPERTY OF THE PERSON OF THE

MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF ACB TEST VALIDITY
COEFFICIENTS FOR MOS GROUPS
(Decimal points omitted)

				!			ACB	Tests	ø								
MOS Group	AR ¹	WK	CI	Ж	SK	EI	rı	MC	AI	PA	AP	AD	ខ	క	8	£	No of Samples
	Α.	Mean Validity Coefficient	Valid	ity Co	effic	ient			<u>.</u>								
₂ 00	77	39	38	37	41	29	43	41	31	38	34	31	28	28	19	12	9
FA EL	28 0	2 4	52	54	24	57	57	2 2 2 4	43 43	2 6 40 7	3 t	5 7 7 8	35 35 35	35 35	67 77	11	21
OF	33	30	42	28	33	23	34	34	32	25	. 27	21	18	23	2	: ==	ន
SC	09	26	67	53	51	77	48	55	34	51	65	30	27	34	34	9	σ
Æ	22	23	27	23	27	55	62	29	57	20	40	23	34	30	28	34	20
В	55	51	24	25	09	48	28	55	47	38	30	28	31	32	28	14	7
ij	62	63	52	26	22	40	45	77	53	37	43	34	53	41	21	7	18
ST	62	09	23	9	9	65	20	55	34	67	43	32	35	33	56	-05	13
	æ.	Standard Dev	ırd De		iation of		, Validity (Coefficients	icien	t s							
₂ 00	5	9	7	5	9	S	7	4	7	7	ო	4	'n	9	9	12	
FA	15	10	4	18	œ	14	7	6	0	7	'n	15	9	7	10	-	
EL	6	∞	7	11	œ	10	7	6	œ	6	7	10	œ	œ	11	11	
OF	13	16	11	13	14	10	12	12	13	22	13	17	7	14	10	6	
SC	7	6	Ŋ	10	7	10	7	œ	6	7	ស	10	พ	15	9	14	
Æ	11	11	7	13	6	10	œ	11	7	13	7	12	9	σ,	12	σ	
Æ	10	15	∞	11	ς,	7	11	10	16	00	14	Ś	18	22	13	14	
다	Ŋ	7	7	œ	∞	11	σ	0	σ	σ	9	σ	9	11	20	14	
ST	11	11	7	œ	11	9	13	9	7	œ	Ŋ	9	4	14	15	10	

Part 2 Table B-6

SPACE AND PROPERTY.

MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF VALIDITY COEFFICIENTS OF NON-ACB TESTS FOR MOS GROUPS (Decimal points omitted)

								Š	n-ACB	Non-ACB Tests	8								
MOS Group		A ³	æ	၁	Δ .	ខា	[2. ,	ဗ	æ	H	רי	pa	Age	×	д	Œ	z	0	
		A.	Mea	n Val	idity	Coef	Mean Validity Coefficient	nt											
200 200		33	30	27	35	22	27	32	14	- 4-	32	31	20 36	36	7 7 7	3 6	32	3 8 9 8	
EL		37	45	22	26	33	35	26	25	11	36	45	56	67	53	38	45	55	
OF		24	56	16	30	14	22	54	9 ;	7 2	17	788	14 26	722	5 o	7 7 7 8	34	788	
¥ و ع		98	53	27	9 9	3 6	97	53 4	; £	502	8 2	£ 5	22	7 1	22	3 8	51	26	
£		14	,	27	47	8	32	9	28	19	53	42	27	9	47	57	77	87	
ಕ		20	54	88	75	15	15	34	18	٣	33	84	28	70	75	42	28	35	
ST		77	53	22	20	54	19	77	54	4	27	47	54	48	23	41	33	77	
		B.	Stan	dard	Devia	tion	Standard Deviation of Validity Coefficients	lidit	у Сое	ffici	ents								
200		9	٣	٣	7	2	٧	S	S	10	4	00	9	7	σ	7	S	'n	
FA	-	16	7	-	16	11	S	01	-	15	15	14	12	6	S	9	-	'n	
EL		∞	œ	9	13	15	δ	12	10	18	14	14	14	7	7	œ	^	=	
0F		16	6	6	13	18	11	12	9	6	œ	13	11	13	11	σ.		~	
SC		15	œ	14	œ	11	12	œ	10	11	æ	σ	œ	ဖ	~	4	~	~	
£	_	13	œ	11	6	12	12	07	15	11	15	13	13	11	σ	σ	•	9	
£	_	7.	9	11	-	11	6	13	9	∞	19	15	12	11	Ś	13	11	~ ;	
ಕ		6	6	σ	2	13	2	œ	=	11	2	12	17	7	7	00	ø	=	
ST		11	15	6	10	16	11	6	15	21	15	17	12	œ	σ	σ	^	•	
}	-																		
Note	1See Table A-1 for titles of ACB tests	te A-1	for titl	es of A(CB tests	_													
••	2See Table B-5 for full titles of MOS groups	že B-5	for ful	I titles c	f MOS	groups													
	³ Titles of Non-ACB tests.	f Non-	ACB te	غ <u>ن</u>	i			(ë		<u>.</u>	•						
	1	Intrac	100	A Subtraction and Division less				9	Liect		כומני	150	į						

A Subtraction and Division Test
B Tool Knowledge Test
C General Adjustment Scale
D Science Test
E Electronics Inventory · High
F Electronics Inventory · Łow

G Electronics Picture Test Occupational Interest: H Biology † Construction
J General
Ed Years of Education

and the second of the second

min a consessionable of the money will be seen and the seed to be seen to be

Age Age in years

K Pattern Analysis (Old)

L Mechanical Aptitude

M Army Clerical Speed

N Shop Mechanics

O Electronics Information (Old)

Table B-7 Part l

and the state of t

MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF BETA WEIGHTS FOR 33 VARIABLES
BY MOS GROUP
(Decimal points omitted)

ACB Test No. of EI TI MC AI PA AP AD CC CA CE CM Sample -05 06 03 07 07 08 11 04 08 -04 02 5 10 08 07 03 00 07 07 08 11 04 07 -04 -06 04 07 09 02 03 -01 -09 01 02 -04 01 -04 -06 06 14 03 09 10 02 -04 06 10 -02 02 07 08 12 01 -04 08 05 04 07 09 04 07 08 12 01 -04 08 05 04 07 00 05 06 06 14 03 09 05 -03 10 -05 01 07 08 12 01 09 07 06 -01 11 05 -07 08 12 01 09 07 06 01 11 05 -07 09 07 08 12 10 11 11 11 12 12 09 01 09 07 08 06 08 09 07 08 09 07 08 06 10 09 07 10 12 10 07 08 06 10 09 07 10 12 10 07 08 06 11 11 09 08 09 09 09 07 04 05 07 08 06 10 08 09 09 09 07 00 01 01 11 00 08 04 09 13 06 07 04 05 07 06 10 08 08 09 08 07 10 01 11 00 08 08 09 08 07 10 01 11 00 08 08 09 09 09 07 10 01 11 00 08 08 09 09 09 07 10 01 11 00 08 08 09 09 09 07 10 01 11 00 08 08 09 09 09 07 10 01 11 00 08 08 09 09 09 07 10 01 11 00 08 08 09 09 09 07 10 01 11 00 08 08 09 09 09 07 10 01 11 00 08 08 09 09 09 07 10 01 11 00 08 08 09 09 09 07 10 01 11 00 08 08 09 09 09 07 10 01 11			\parallel															
AI PA AP AD CC CA CE CM -01 -09 01 02 -04 01 -04 -01 03 00 02 02 -04 01 -04 -01 03 09 10 02 -04 06 10 -02 14 03 09 10 02 -04 06 10 -02 15 01 -04 08 05 04 07 00 04 03 09 05 -03 10 -05 01 05 09 04 05 07 08 06 08 05 09 04 05 07 08 06 08 05 09 04 05 07 08 06 12 12 10 18 14 08 13 10 12 00 05 04 07 00 09 05 06 10 07 06 09 07 06 10 11 10 10 08 07 09 08 06 10 07 09 08 06 10 07 09 08 06 10 07 09 09 07 09 07 10 11 19 10 11 11 19 10 10 10 11 10 11									ACB T	est								No.
07 07 08 11 04 08 -04 02 -01 -09 01 02 -04 01 -04 -01 03 00 07 07 00 04 07 -04 03 09 10 02 -04 06 10 -02 14 03 09 05 -03 10 -02 05 12 01 09 05 -01 11 05 -07 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 0	AR ¹ WK GI MK SK EI T	WK GI MK SK EI	MK SK EI	SK EI	EI		H	Ħ	MC	AI	PA	AP	ΑЪ	ည	క	SE	풀	Sampl
07 07 08 11 04 08 -04 02 -01 03 00 07 07 00 04 07 -01 03 09 10 02 -04 01 -04 -01 03 09 10 02 -04 01 -04 -01 03 09 10 02 -04 06 10 -02 12 01 -02 02 02 02 03 11 -04 03 09 05 -03 10 -02 02 03 01 01 03 09 05 -03 10 -02 01 02 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	A. Mean Beta Weight				ght													
-01 -09 01 02 -04 01 -04 -01 03 00 07 07 00 04 07 -04 03 03 02 02 03 -03 11 -04 -01 03 09 10 02 -04 06 10 -02 05 12 01 -04 08 05 04 07 00 04 07 00 05 01 09 07 06 -01 11 05 -07 05 05 05 05 05 05 05 05 05 05 05 05 05	05 -02 04 02 -05	-02 04 02 -05	04 02 -05	02 - 05	-05			90	03	07	07	80	11	90	80	-04	02	5
03 00 07 07 00 04 07 -04 09 02 02 03 -03 11 -04 -01 03 09 10 02 -04 06 10 -02 14 03 05 01 -02 02 02 05 12 01 -04 08 05 04 07 00 04 03 09 05 -03 10 -05 01 01 09 07 06 -01 11 05 -07 05 09 04 05 07 08 06 05 04 00 09 04 02 08 06 12 12 10 18 14 08 13 10 12 10 07 08 06 10 07 06 09 09 05 04 07 10 12 11 12 10 07 08 06 10 07 06 09 09 05 04 07 10 12 11 12 10 07 08 06 10 07 06 09 08 06 10 07 06	18 02 02 20 -10 09	02 20 -10	20 -10	-10		60		02	03	-01	-00	01	05	- 04	01	-04	-01	7
09 02 02 03 -03 11 -04 -01 03 09 02 02 02 02 -04 06 10 -02 14 03 05 01 -02 02 02 02 02 05 12 01 -04 08 05 -03 10 -05 01 01 09 07 06 -01 11 05 -07 00 05 04 07 06 08 06 08 06 08 06 06 08 06 06 09 05 06 07 07 06 07 06 07 06 07 06 07 06 07 06 07 06 07 06 07 06 07 06 07 07 06 07 06 07 06 07 06 07 06 07 06 07 06 07 06 07 06 07 06 07 06 07 06 07 07 07 07 07 07 07 07 07 07 07 07 07	00 04 06 -03	04 06 -03	06 -03	-03		10		08	02	ე ე	00	02	02	8	07	07	-04	17
03 09 10 02 -04 06 10 -02 14 03 05 01 -02 02 02 05 12 01 -04 08 05 04 07 00 04 03 09 05 -03 10 -05 01 01 09 07 06 -01 11 05 -07 05 09 04 05 07 08 06 08 02 04 00 09 04 02 08 06 12 12 10 18 14 08 13 10 08 09 05 04 07 10 12 11 12 10 07 08 06 10 07 06 09 13 06 07 04 05 06 10 09 08 07 10 12 11 09 08 07 10 07 06	03 16 -02 -06	16 -02 -06	-02 -06	90-	·	-06		07	07	60	05	05	03	-03	11	-04	-01	6
14 03 05 01 -02 02 05 12 01 -04 08 05 04 07 00 04 03 09 05 -03 10 -02 01 01 09 07 06 -01 11 05 -07 05 09 04 05 07 08 06 08 02 04 05 07 08 06 08 12 10 18 14 08 13 10 12 10 07 08 06 07 09 05 04 07 10 12 11 12 10 07 08 06 10 09 13 06 10 07 06 09 08 07 06 10 09 08 07 06 10 09 08 07 06 10 09 08 07 06 10 09 08 07 06 10 09 08 07 06 10 09 06 07	08 00 13 02	00 13 02	13 02	05		01		00	9	03	60	10	05	-04	90	10	-05	^
12 01 -04 08 05 04 07 00 04 03 09 05 -03 10 -02 01 01 09 07 06 -01 11 05 -07 02 04 00 09 04 02 08 06 12 12 10 18 14 08 13 10 12 10 07 08 06 10 07 06 09 09 05 04 07 10 12 11 12 10 07 08 06 14 10 11 09 08 07 10 06 14 10 11	00 06 08 04	70 80 90	08 04	04		90		90	90	14	03	02	01	-02	05	05	05	17
04 03 09 05 -03 10 -02 01 01 09 07 06 -01 11 05 -07 02 04 00 09 04 02 08 06 12 12 10 18 14 08 13 10 20 05 11 19 10 10 08 07 08 09 05 04 07 10 12 11 12 10 07 08 06 10 07 06 09 13 06 07 04 05 06 10	-06 06 07 14	06 07 14	07 14	14		02		07	90	12	0.5	-04	98	05	07	07	8	4
01 09 07 06 -01 11 05 -07 05 09 04 05 07 08 06 08 02 04 00 09 04 02 08 06 12 12 10 18 14 08 13 10 20 05 11 19 10 10 08 07 08 09 05 04 07 10 12 11 12 10 07 08 06 10 07 06 09 13 06 07 04 05 06 10	11 05 11 09	05 11 09	11 09	60		05		03	03	70	03	60	05	-03	10	-0 -	0	13
05 09 04 05 07 08 06 02 04 12 12 10 18 14 08 13 20 05 11 19 10 10 08 08 09 05 04 07 10 12 10 07 08 06 10 07 08 06 10 07 09 08 07 10 07 08 06 10 07 09 08 07 10 06 14 10	04 03 06 15 01	03 06 15 01	06 15 01	15 01	01		_	7	60	01	6	02	90	-01	11	05	-07	2
05 05 09 04 05 07 08 06 00 00 02 04 00 09 04 02 08 13 11 12 12 10 18 14 08 13 05 07 20 05 11 19 10 10 08 05 08 09 05 04 07 10 12 10 07 08 06 10 07 04 09 08 07 10 07 08 06 10 07 08 08 09 08 07 00 06 14 10 08 08 09 08 07 10 06 14 10	B. Standard Deviation of Beta	Deviation	Deviation			of Bets	يد	ı We	ighta									
00 02 04 00 09 04 02 08 11 12 12 10 18 14 08 13 07 20 05 11 19 10 10 08 05 08 09 05 04 07 10 12 10 12 10 07 08 06 10 07 04 09 13 06 07 04 05 06 08 09 08 07 10 12	09 12 04 06 10	12 04 06 10	04 06 10	06 10	10			12	05	05	60	70	05	07	80	90	80	
11 12 12 10 18 14 08 13 07 20 05 11 19 10 10 08 05 08 09 05 04 07 10 12 10 12 10 07 08 06 10 07 04 09 13 06 07 04 05 06 08 09 08 07 10 06 14 10	03 07 15 09	07 15 09	15 09	60		14		8	8	02	04	00	60	04	05	90	90	
07 20 05 11 19 10 10 08 05 08 09 05 04 07 10 12 10 12 10 07 08 06 10 07 04 09 13 06 07 04 05 06 08 09 08 07 10 06 14 10	09 10 09 12	10 09 12	09 12	12		11		15	11	12	12	10	18	14	08	13	10	
05 08 09 05 04 07 10 12 10 12 10 07 08 06 10 07 04 05 06 08 09 08 07 10 06 14 10 06 14 10	15 11 13 10 13	11 13 10 13	13 10 13	10 13	13			80	07	20	05	11	19	10	10	80	02	
10 12 10 07 08 06 10 07 04 05 06 06 06 06 07 04 05 06 06 08 09 08 07 10 06 14 10	06 06 13 09	06 13 09	13 09	60		60		12	05	08	60	05	04	03	10	12	11	
04 09 13 06 07 04 05 06 08 09 08 07 10 06 14 10	11 09 09 11 09	09 09 11 09	09 11 09	11 09	60		_	07	10	12	10	07	90	90	10	07	9	
08 09 08 07 10 06 14 10	14 06 07 10 10	06 07 10 10	07 10 10	10 10	10		_	80	07	60	13	90	07	70	9	90	2	
	09 il 09 09 ll 10 0	09 09 11 10	09 11 10	11 10	2 8		٠,	<u>∞</u> د	80 t	60	80	07	10	90	t t	2 5	Ξ:	

								Non	Non-ACB	Tests								
MOS Group	A ³	æ l	ပ	ū	চ্য	ĹΣų	9	Н	I	J.	Ed	Age	×	н	Σ	z	0	
	A.	Me	Mean Bo	Beta W	Weight													ļ
₂ 00	01	01	01	03	00	02	-01	90-	01	01	10	02	-03	90	70-	8	70	
FA	04	17	90	-08	10	00	-05	60	00	90-	16	60	0.5	-11	0.5	-17	3 6	
EL	-05	01	05	04	07	00	01	8	70	01	80	80	11	-03	02	01	20	
OF	05	05	05	01	00	90	-04	00	80	01	04	07	-01	-03	11	-03	5 8	
SC	01	05	-02	01	05	01	10	-03	03	04	03	80	07	80	-01	-03	0 2	
MM	05	0	-01	90	05	07	-01	01	05	03	90	14	0	03	3.5	3 6	ر د	
Œ.	90	03	00	-01	-02	01	-04	-02	-01	-08	07	16	04	-04	-05	-02	9 6	
Cľ.	60	00	04	-02	01	-03	00	-02	70	90	00	90	-01	-05	70	-0.5	8 6	
SI	03	05	05	00	8	90	-05	01	-05	03	10	0.2	04	80	03	05	0.5	
	B.	Sta	Standard		Deviations	so st	Beta	Weights	ıts									
₂ 00	60	60	03	10	05	05	07	03	11	03	05	S	1	2.1	ô	2	ď	
FA	01	05	05	01	03	01	02	02	02	90	70	080	60	02	3 8	6	3 6	
EL	15	12	10	12	10	14	10	10	60	60	08	080	17	9	2,5	7 .	3 2	
OF	21	11	10	18	15	80	15	10	14	90	60	80	10	10] [3 2	12	
SC	10	02	13	13	80	12	80	60	03	07	90	10	07	60	05	6	: e	
W.	80	12	60	90	07	10	80	90	80	60	60	80	10	07	60	60	8 g	
CM:	13	2	90	12	07	13	10	02	02	10	05	90	05	01	05	03	70	
CL	11	10	13	11	07	10	11	13	07	60	10	14	08	60	60	80	90	
ST	11	14	02	15	90	11	11	70	13	07	10	60	11	80	60	60	11	
																		1

Note: 1 See Table A-1 for titles of ACB tests.

2See Table B-5 for full titles of MOS groups. 3See Table B-6 for titles of non-ACB tests.

Table B-8

AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER

BETA WEIGHTS FOR PROPOSED ARMY CLASSIFICATION BATTERY BY MOS GROUP (Decimal points omitted)

	··					¥	ACB Test	st								
MOS Group	AR	WK	GI	吳	SK	EI	II	MC	AI	PA	AP	AD	8	క	CB	£
203	13	-02	02	8	07	-05	15	90	90	60	88	13	60		-04	03
F.	23	03	08	21	-02	60	03	90	-02	-04	02	01	03	07	01	07
13	14	08	04	80	-05	18	12	12	60	05	05	02	-01	90	17	-01
OF	03	01	20	01	00	90-	04	60	13	-01	07	07	-01	14	-07	03
SC	18	12	03	04	-05	05	70	12	90	13	17	03	-02	90	60	-05
Æ	,80	-02	08	17	07	13	10	04	19	80	07	-03	-01	14	-07	19
СЖ	13	-13	12	11	15	90	11	12	18	-03	-02	05	02	07	02	-05
CL	22	21	80	14	03	07	8	-04	05	-04	07	60	90	12	-08	-04
ST	15	07	05	18	13	13	-01	07	90	90	80	05	00	04	-05	-10

Note: 1 See Table A-1 for attles of ACB tests.

² See Table B-5 for full titles of MOS groups.

emerges a secretary section of the country of the c

APPENDIX C

Table C-1

many to fit the specific of the second secon

MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF BETA WEIGHTS FOR HIGH SCHOOL COURSES AND SELECTED VARIABLES BY MOS GROUP (Decimal points omitted)

						Š	eac moo	5	serected valuables	7	וומח.	ם ט						
MOS Group	AR	AI	S.	중	5	⋖	α	ပ	Ω	(c)	ŢZĄ	O	H	H	'n	Ed	Age	No. of Samples
	Α.	Mean	Beta	Weight	ht													
ç	20	07	90	Š	ă	70	Š	ć	Š	5	٤	9	Š	2	0	5	9	v
FA	23	² 6	14	දු ස	88	38	3 8	-03	5 7	3 6	3 =	8 8	-04	5 5	-02	7 2	8 =	n ~
3.	18	07	12	-02	03	05	-01	05	-01	05	8	90-	03	-01	-02	07	60	21
)F	03	11	-03	02	11	-02	03	20	03	03	-61	05	01	01	-03	90	10	11
ပ္ပ	19	01	12	03	05	05	01	-01	-04	05	-01	-05	90	01	-02	90	63	9
¥	13	18	8	90	02	01	01	01	-02	02	8	8	03	0	8	0	18	20
X.	21	13	07	-01	-01	-05	03	01	-03	07	-02	90-	07	01	-05	10	16	5
1.	20	05	05	05	60	-03	-02	-02	-02	-03	-02	-03	03	05	-05	18	05	18
Τί	17	03	03	01	07	-05	01	-01	90-	8	02	-04	8	11	-03	17	00	11
	.	Stand	ard	Devia	tion	Deviation of Beta Weights	ta Wei	ghts										
o.	60	10	13	60	8	13	19	13	90	70	90	ຣ	8	0	8	15	7,5	
Y.	14	00	07	80	8	13	00	05	05	07	02	05	02	04	02	05	07	
17	17	13	12	11	10	60	10	10	07	90	12	10	8	6	10	12	11	
)F	13	22	60	90	15	12	60	14	60	60	8	13	13	10	10	18	80	
SC	03	ב.	01	11	0	07	02	07	07	80	60	05	07	11	07	07	12	
¥	12	11	60	08	01	60	6	07	07	60	11	60	8	80	0	8	8	
Σ	80	07	13	07	07	0.7	05	6	07	90	12	02	80	13	15	0	80	
13	90	11	15	10	13	08	10	10	10	07	80	0	10	07	02	80	12	
TS	12	15	02	11	13	90	90	07	70	90	02	13	10	11	80	19	20	
Note: 1 H	1 High School Courses and Selected Variables	ourses a	nd Sele	cted Va	riables									(
AR AI	AR Arithmetic Reasoning Test Al Automotive Information Test	Reason	ng Test	, to	V B	A Biology Course B Chemistry	95.5	w u	Hygiene Physics	a	- 7		Woodworking Metalworking	5 0 <u>0</u>				
: 8		Interest	Measure	نو ا	Š	General Science	ence	U		Science	Щ		s of Edu	cation				
S C	Maintenance Interes	e Intere	st Measure	are		Electrical Shop	oot	I	Algebra	•	Age	Age in years	4					
,			۰	,									•					

APPENDIX D Table D-1

QUOTAS FOR OLD AND NEW APTITUDE AREA SYSTEM MOS GROUPS

Old Ap Area S	otitude ystem	New Ap Area S	titude ystem	•
MOS Group	% of Input	MOS Group	% of	Input
IN	21 ,	со	27	
AE	16	RT :	. 1 08	
EL	08	EL	08	
GM	05	OF	10	
MM	16	sc	06	ŧ
CL	15	MM ,	. 12	1
GT	16	. · GM	: 05	
RC	03	CL	, 12	
		ST	12	}
		\$,

Table D-2 Part 1

BETA WEIGHTS FOR OPERATIONAL AND EXPERIMENTAL TESTS
(Decimal points omitted)

		-														
						Operational	iona	l Tests	Ø							
MOS Group	AR ¹	WK	19	MK	SK	EI	II	MC	AI	PA	AP	AD	23	క	CE	ਣ
200	13	-03	-02	8	90	90-	11	70	-01	80	88	12	88	8	-03	02
FA	24	02	02	16	-03	8	90-	03	-00	-10	-01	-05	01	8	8	60
EL	16	02	02	08	-05	14	07	10	05	05	07	0]	-01	05	16	8
OF	03	01	20	-01	01	-07	70	10	14	00	90	05	-02	13	-05	04
SC	23	13	02	80	-02	03	8	10	90	10	18	05	-02	90	10	-07
W	90	-02	05	13	05	80	07	01	13	90	07	-05	-02	12	-10	16
СМ	10	-13	60	11	16	60	60	12	16	-03	-01	05	03	90	05	-00
CL	18	20	90	15	90	80	01	-04	07	-04	90	80	05	11	90-	00
ST	15	07	02	19	14	16	00	90	05	07	90	04	01	90	-03	-07

Part 2 Table D-2

						Ħ	xperi	Experimental	l Tests	rs Fs							
MOS Group A ³ B C D E	A ³	A	Ö	D	闰	ţzı	ני	Ħ	Ħ	ט	Бā	Àge	*	H	ጆ	z	0
200	00	03	-02	80	05	63	70	01	0.10	8	-01	12	15	-03	-04	01	
FA	10	60	10	-16	03	01	-01	28	-05	07	20	21	05	07	00	-11	8
EL	03	-01	03	02	10	-02	-05	02	-02	01	02	10	-03	05	90-	70	04
OF	-01	-07	10	-08	03	-05	-02	90	10	-04	05	01	03	-05	-08	05	05
SC	70	00	04	-08	05	90-	-16	02	-04	02	02	13	05	-03	60-	15	80
MM	00	03	05	-02	05	-01	90	60	14	02	03	10	90	90-	90-	80	05
СМ	04	-07	-13	02	05	05	12	10	03	00	60	60	8	-18	70	60	-05
CT	03	-02	03	-05	04	-01	90	05	02	-04	01	15	-10	-07	-07	10	00
ST	8	07	07	90	03	07	-05	-09	00	03	03	13	-13	-05	03	03	-13

Note: 1 See Table A-1 for titles of ACB (operational) tests.

² See Table B-5 for full titles of MOS groups.

³ See Table B-6 for full titles of non-ACB (experimental) tests.

Table D-3

を使えるというできないというないで、 できない このではなって、 ともないです。 これないない

INTERCORRELATIONS* OF OLD AND NEW ARMY QUALIFICATION BAITERY
APTITUDE AREA* COMPOSITES
(Decimal points omitted)

MAM CL GT FA EL OF MM GM CL ST ED APQT 44 57 66 81 65 59 52 57 67 61 67 36 63 79 50 59 66 64 70 72 55 58 32 72 71 36 44 58 50 56 70 76 49 54 35 72 71 36 44 58 50 56 67 61 67 36 67 90 39 48 59 57 77 59 38 44 39 78 48 86 00 82 76 82 83 84 77 79 59 76 80 89 76 82 83 84 84 86 77 89 86 76																	
CL GT CO FA EL OF MM GM CL ST ED 57 66 81 65 59 52 57 67 61 67 36 47 55 66 64 67 70 76 72 55 58 32 36 44 58 50 56 58 71 59 38 44 39 39 48 72 75 63 59 55 78 83 82 47 86 00 86 72 77 83 74 43 48 24 30 86 72 75 63 59 55 78 83 82 47 86 00 82 78 69 91 89 99 55 72 80 00 82 78 69 91 89 99 55 73 89 82 00 82 78 69 76 82 83 81 44 74 89 82 00 82 78 69 76 82 83 81 44 75 89 82 00 82 78 69 91 89 91 57 76 80 90 82 00 84 71 76 43 78 91 82 87 84 81 84 00 82 90 54 83 89 83 88 71 72 61 82 00 88 58 84 57 43 50 34 54 58 55 00	Old AQB System		∂B Sy		stem						Ne			eш			
57 66 81 65 59 52 57 67 61 67 36 47 55 64 70 72 89 86 76 49 54 35 50 59 66 64 67 70 76 72 55 58 32 32 44 39 36 44 58 50 56 58 71 59 38 44 39 39 48 59 57 67 77 83 74 43 48 24 90 86 76 69 55 78 83 82 47 86 00 80 89 76 66 69 91 88 44 44 75 89 76 86 89 76 88 81 71 76 43 63 76 89 76 86	IN AE EL GM		₩		Æ	티	CI	00	FA	EL	OF	Æ.	GM	ᇊ	ST	ឧប	AFQT
47 55 64 70 72 89 86 76 49 54 35 50 59 66 64 67 70 76 72 55 58 32 36 44 58 50 56 58 71 59 38 44 39 39 48 59 57 67 77 83 74 43 48 24 90 86 75 63 59 55 78 83 82 47 86 00 80 89 76 66 69 91 89 99 55 63 76 80 86 76 80 90 81 44 75 89 76 86 89 71 76 43 63 76 86 84 80 77 90 84 61 69 34	51		41		77	57	99	81	65	59	52	57	67	61	67	36	63
50 59 66 64 67 70 76 72 55 58 32 36 44 58 50 56 58 71 59 38 44 39 39 48 59 57 67 77 83 74 43 48 24 90 86 75 67 77 83 74 43 48 24 90 86 75 67 77 83 74 43 48 24 72 86 75 63 59 55 78 83 81 44 75 89 76 66 69 91 89 99 55 63 76 86 84 80 77 90 84 71 76 43 59 66 69 84 81 84 71 76 43 78	7.1		99		87	47	55	9	20	72	88	86	9/	67	ς 4	35	29
36 44 58 50 56 58 71 59 38 44 39 39 48 59 57 67 77 83 74 43 48 24 90 86 72 75 63 59 55 78 83 82 47 86 00 80 76 66 69 91 89 99 55 75 89 76 66 69 91 89 99 55 63 76 82 76 82 83 81 44 75 89 82 77 90 84 71 76 43 59 66 69 84 80 87 84 81 84 71 76 43 59 66 88 84 80 77 90 84 71 76 43 78	71 00 68	0	89		79	20	59	99	9	29	20	9/	72	55	28	32	72
39 48 59 57 67 77 83 74 43 48 24 00 86 72 75 63 59 55 78 83 82 47 86 00 80 89 76 66 69 91 89 99 55 72 80 00 82 78 69 76 82 83 81 44 75 89 82 00 84 80 84 71 76 43 59 66 69 84 80 84 71 76 43 55 69 84 77 90 84 71 76 43 55 69 76 80 82 81 72 65 50 55 69 76 84 81 84 61 69 34 78 81 84	00 89	00 8			71	36	77	28	20	26	28	71	29	38	77	39	78
QD 86 72 75 63 59 55 78 83 82 47 86 00 80 89 76 66 69 91 89 99 55 72 80 00 82 78 69 76 82 83 81 44 75 89 82 00 84 71 76 43 59 66 69 84 77 90 84 71 76 43 59 66 69 84 77 90 84 71 76 43 55 69 76 80 82 90 84 61 69 34 78 89 81 84 81 84 61 69 34 83 89 83 84 81 84 61 69 34 84 88 30 34 34	79 71	9 71			00	39	84	29	27	29	77	83	74	43	84	54	65
86 00 80 89 76 66 69 91 89 99 55 72 80 00 82 78 69 76 82 83 81 44 75 89 82 00 88 84 80 87 88 91 57 63 76 88 00 77 90 84 71 76 43 59 66 69 84 77 00 82 81 72 65 50 78 91 82 84 81 84 61 69 34 78 91 82 84 81 84 61 69 34 83 89 88 71 72 61 82 90 54 82 99 81 91 76 65 69 90 88 70 55 47	50 36	96 0			39	8	98	72	75	63	29	55	78	83	82	47	72
72 80 00 82 78 69 76 82 83 81 44 75 89 82 00 88 84 80 87 88 91 57 63 76 78 88 00 77 90 84 71 76 43 59 66 69 84 77 00 82 81 72 65 50 78 91 76 80 90 82 00 84 61 69 34 83 89 83 84 81 84 61 69 34 82 99 83 71 72 61 82 90 54 82 99 81 91 76 65 69 90 88 40 55 47 55 74 55 76 76 86 75 84 42	59 44	77 6		7	φ	98	00	80	89	9/	99	69	91	83	66	55	84
75 89 82 00 88 84 80 87 88 91 57 63 76 78 88 00 77 90 84 71 76 43 59 66 69 84 77 00 82 81 72 65 50 55 69 76 80 90 82 00 84 61 69 34 78 91 82 87 84 81 84 61 69 34 83 89 83 88 71 72 61 82 90 54 82 99 81 91 76 65 69 90 88 00 55 47 55 44 57 43 50 34 54 58 55 00 72 84 85 79 76 66 76 86	66 58	6 58		٠,	29	72	80	8	82	78	69	9/	82	83	81	77	85
63 76 78 88 00 77 90 84 71 76 43 59 66 69 84 77 00 82 81 72 65 50 55 69 76 80 90 82 00 84 61 69 34 78 91 82 87 84 81 84 00 82 90 54 83 89 83 88 71 72 61 82 00 88 30 54 82 99 81 91 76 65 69 90 88 30 55 47 55 44 57 43 50 34 54 58 55 00 72 84 85 79 76 66 76 86 75 84 42	64 50	4 50			22	75	68	82	8	88	84	80	87	88	91	57	79
59 66 69 84 77 00 82 81 72 65 50 55 69 76 80 90 82 00 84 61 69 34 78 91 82 87 84 81 84 00 82 90 54 83 89 83 88 71 72 61 82 00 88 58 58 47 55 44 57 43 50 34 54 58 55 00 72 84 85 79 76 66 76 86 75 84 42	67 56	95 /		_	29	63	9/	78	88	8	11	90	84	71	9/	43	9/
55 69 76 80 90 82 00 84 61 69 34 78 91 82 87 84 81 84 00 82 90 54 83 89 83 88 71 72 61 82 00 88 58 82 99 81 91 76 65 69 90 88 00 55 47 55 44 57 43 50 34 54 58 55 00 72 84 85 79 76 66 76 86 75 84 42	70 58	0 58			11	29	99	69	478	77	8	82	81	72	65	20	99
78 91 82 87 84 81 84 00 82 90 54 83 89 83 88 71 72 61 82 00 88 58 82 99 81 91 76 65 69 90 88 00 55 47 55 44 57 43 50 34 54 58 55 00 72 84 85 79 76 66 76 86 75 84 42	76 71	6 71			83	55	69	9/	80	90	82	8	84	61	69	34	9/
83 89 83 88 71 72 61 82 00 88 58 82 99 81 91 76 65 69 90 88 00 55 47 55 44 57 43 50 34 54 58 55 00 72 84 85 79 76 66 76 86 75 84 42	72 59	2 59			74	78	91	82	87	84	81	84	0	85	90	54	98
82 99 81 91 76 65 69 90 88 00 55 47 55 44 57 43 50 34 54 58 55 00 72 84 85 79 76 66 76 86 75 84 42	55 38	5 38		•	£4	83	89	83	88	7.1	72	61	82	8	88	28	75
47 55 44 57 43 50 34 54 58 55 00 72 84 85 79 76 66 76 86 75 84 42	58 44	5 44		•	48	82	66	81	91	9/	65	69	90	88	S	55	84
72 84 85 79 76 66 76 86 75 84 42	32 39	2 39			54	47	55	77	57	43	20	34	54	28	55	8	42
	72	7	78		9	72	84	85	79	9/	99	9/	98	75	84	75	8

^a The intercorrelations used for mental Category IV personnel (AFQT scores 10-30).

^b RC and SC aptitude areas omitted.

Table D-4

INTERCORRELATION*OF NEW ARMY CLASSIFICATION BATTERY APTITUDE AREA COMPOSITES (Decimal points omitted)

	8	FA	EL	OF	W	Æ	占	ST	ED	AFQT
00	8	83	84	7.1	75	83	83	82	77	. 8
FA	83	00	88	84	75	85	88	92	61	78
EL	84	88	00	73	86	90	73	83	45	80
OF	7.1	84	73	8	75	81	74	89	20	67
W	75	75	86	75	00	85	54	70	36	75
CM	83	85	06	81	85	00	74	88	48	82
ដ	83	88	73	74	54	74	8	83	59	73
ST	82	92	83	89	70	88	83	00	61	80
ED	77	61	45	20	36	84	59	61	8	42
AFQT	84	78	80	29	75	82	73	80	75	8

^a These intercorrelations used for mental Category I, iI, and III personnel (AFQT scores 31-100).

b SC Aptitude Area omitted.